

ROZANOV AND THE WORD

Thesis submitted for the Degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
at the  
University of London  
by  
Liza Lucasta Dimbleby

School of Slavonic and East European Studies  
London

1996



### ABSTRACT

The thesis is an attempt to relate aspects of Rozanov's writing to the Russian tradition of the word, as exemplified in the work of writers and thinkers, contemporary and near-contemporary to Rozanov. The first part establishes key features of this tradition through the work of writers such as Ern, Losev, Mandel'shtam and Averintsev. The relevance of Bakhtin for a reading of Rozanov, and of Rozanov for reading Bakhtin, is argued through an extended comparison of the two writers in the context of the Russian tradition of the word. Aspects of Rozanov's thought and formal expression, such as silence, intonation and the resisting of definition are discussed in relation to this tradition. The role of intimate genres and the reader is discussed with reference to Dostoevskii, Rozanov and Bakhtin. Rozanov's use of letters, footnotes and the idea of manuscripts is examined as a part of his battle with received literary forms. The second part looks at these various aspects of Rozanov's work in relation to his contemporary context; to the writing of the obscure 'literary exiles' and that of Solov'ev and Merezhkovskii. Rozanov's particular sense of the word is argued to be crucial in his attitude towards these writers. Rozanov's involvement with the decadents is discussed, and his exemplification of themes of sectarianism and apocalypse in his writing. The thesis ends with a look at the paradoxes of Rozanov's own role as a writer supposedly in battle with literature, and the relation between his need for words and his need for belief.

## CONTENTS

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| List of Abbreviations | 4 |
| Introduction          | 5 |

### Part One

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Chapter I: The Tradition of the Word in Russian<br>Thought: Rozanov and Bakhtin        | 22  |
| Chapter II: Forms of Expression and Understanding<br>in Rozanov's Approach to the Word | 109 |
| Chapter III: Intimate Genres and the Reader  | 205 |
| Chapter IV: Letters, Manuscript, Print and the Press                                   | 239 |

### Part Two

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Chapter V: Rozanov and the 'Literaturnye izgnanniki' | 294 |
| Chapter VI: Rozanov and Decadence                    | 382 |
| Chapter VII: Literary Sectarianism and Apocalypse    | 426 |
| Chapter VIII: Rozanov, Writing and Religious Belief  | 462 |

|            |     |
|------------|-----|
| Conclusion | 484 |
|------------|-----|

|                       |     |
|-----------------------|-----|
| Notes                 | 488 |
| Selected Bibliography | 553 |

# LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following abbreviations are used for references within the text:

|                  |  |
|------------------|--|
| <u>Ued.</u>      | Uedinennoe, 1912                                     |
| <u>Smert.</u>    | Smertnoe, 1913.                                      |
| <u>O. l. I</u>   | Opavshie list'ia, 1913.                              |
| <u>O. l. II</u>  | Opavshie list'ia. Korob vtoroi<br>i poslednii, 1915. |
| <u>Apok.</u>     | Apokalipsis nashego vremeni,<br>1917-1918            |
| <u>Lit. izg.</u> | Literaturnye izgnanniki, 1913.                       |

Quotes from Literaturnye izgnanniki are taken from V. V. Rozanov, Literaturnye izgnanniki, London, 1992 (reprint of St Petersburg, 1913 edition). All other references are taken from V. V. Rozanov, O sebe i zhizni svoei, comp., ed. V. G. Sukach, Moscow, 1990.



## INTRODUCTION

In the late 1980s and early 1990s, as one of the first consequences of the campaign of glasnost in the Soviet Union, Russians were free, and even encouraged, to rediscover much of their national literature which had been previously unpublished and difficult to obtain. An important area of rediscovery was the Russian religious and philosophical tradition, anathema to the Soviet canon. The new interest in previously suppressed religious thinkers was found both in academic and popular environments. The breadth of style and format of the new publications, in books, journals and pamphlets, and even on television programmes, bears witness to this broad interest.<sup>1</sup> Although the almost fashionable early enthusiasm has begun to wane, the work of publication, republication and analysis of Russian thinkers remains assiduous. The circulation of Rozanov's writing has benefited greatly from this activity.

Rozanov's writing was quickly excluded from Soviet literary study, as Fateev writes, 'в советской России имя Розанова было вытеснено сначала из печати, а потом из памяти'.<sup>2</sup> Yet the early period of communist rule was a time of considerable interest in Rozanov. This interest was evident in emigré writing, in the memoirs of his friends and colleagues, Remizov and Gippius,<sup>3</sup> and in Russia, in Khovin's Knizhnyi ugol, which continued to publish articles by and about Rozanov in Petrograd, and then in Berlin.

Gollerbakh's small book on Rozanov was published in Russia in 1918, just before Rozanov's death.<sup>4</sup> Gollerbakh also published articles on Rozanov's writing in Berlin journals, in the early 1920s.<sup>5</sup> He was angered at the lack of response to Rozanov's death from literary organizations and in the press. Gollerbakh was active in the organization of a Rozanov study circle in Petrograd. In September 1921 an announcement was published in Vestnik literatury, stating the aims of the group.<sup>6</sup> These included the collection of all printed and manuscript materials relating to Rozanov, the compilation of extensive bibliographies of Rozanov's work and of criticism of his work, the collection of Rozanov's letters, a Rozanov section to be instituted in the museum of 'Dom literatorov', the publication of collections of articles and memoirs and the holding of evenings devoted to discussion of the writer. Sadly, these large intentions were not all realized. At the first meeting in October 1921 a committee was formed that included Gollerbakh and Khovin, the critic Volynskii, and notably Andrei Belyi, later so publicly dismissive of Rozanov.<sup>7</sup> The group soon became part of the Vol'noi filosofskoi assotsiatsii (Vol'fila) study circle of which Belyi and Khovin were also founding members. This was an association of general philosophical, spiritual, and political inquiry which continued until 1924. After this time, references to Rozanov within Russia become increasingly rare.

The other main area of Rozanov's influence in

immediate post-revolutionary intellectual life was amongst the formalists, who read and cited Rozanov. Shklovskii was foremost in his attention to Rozanov, with the publication of his book Siuzhet kak iavlenie stil'ia in 1921.<sup>8</sup> In 1922, he cites Rozanov as a key figure in the development of a new way of writing, in his book Zoo, ili pis'ma ne o liubvi: 'Нельзя писать книги по-старому. Это знает Белый, хорошо знал Розанов.'<sup>9</sup> Rozanov's writing on Gogol' was particularly important for the formalists; he was cited notably by Boris Eikhenbaum and Iurii Tynyanov.<sup>10</sup> Several critics have suggested parallels between Rozanov's writing and the work of the futurists, emphasizing Rozanov's sense of the physicality, presence and irrepeatability of the word, which is its guarantee of life in contrast to the imposed schemes and rules of official literary tradition. The religious philosopher Vladimir Il'in wrote explicitly of Rozanov's 'futurism'.<sup>11</sup> Khovin also drew parallels between Rozanov and futurism in the book, Na odnu temu, which concentrates on the work of Rozanov and Maiakovskii, and in the juxtaposition of posthumous publications of Rozanov's articles and 'poslednie list'ia' with futurist publications in his journal, Knizhnyi ugol, in the 1920s.<sup>12</sup> Anna Lisa Crone also asserts that Rozanov's writing is very much in the spirit of futurist statements such as Kruchenykh's introduction to Pomada, in 1913, and the manifesto in Sadok sudei. She compares Rozanov's bid at the disintegration of traditional literary genre with the futurist disintegration of grammatical and syntactical

rules and suggests that this is a valuable area of research.<sup>13</sup>

Remizov, like Rozanov, developed a powerful 'physical' phonetic language that could be seen both as a defiance of existing literary convention and a supremely literary achievement.<sup>14</sup> Neither writer saw himself as adhering to a manifesto, futurist or otherwise, yet they were both important sources of a new approach to the word in prose for those who sought to classify and analyse the new impulses in writing. Remizov characterized Rozanov's linguistic achievement in words that were particularly relevant to the time, as '"живой", "изустный", "мимический"'.<sup>15</sup> Greta Slobin cites Remizov's insistence on the need for words that were like breaths, of 'live unwritten speech'.<sup>16</sup> The love of both writers for the tones of spoken words and their attempt to recreate this in writing, their emphasis on handwriting, on unprinted, private documents, their assertion that private letters should have the status of literature, and the boldness of their experiment with their newly asserted genres can be seen as having parallels with the futurist emphasis on handwriting and spoken resonance, but it is significantly different. Both Rozanov and Remizov also belonged to a different Russian tradition, that valued the writings and legends of Russian sacred literature, seventeenth century religious texts, and a philological culture of spoken words amongst intimates. Mandel'shtam recognized this in his discussion of Rozanov in the article of 1922 'О природе

slova'.<sup>17</sup> Both Rozanov and Remizov were also at the centre of the pre-revolutionary religious and aesthetic renaissance, usually characterized by the terms 'decadence' and 'symbolism' in literary history. At one time Rozanov was closely connected to the leading decadents, Merezhkovskii and Gippius, and he had continuing links with religious thinkers, notably Florenskii. But the titles 'symbolism' and 'decadence' do not do full justice to the range of Remizov's and Rozanov's work. A certain mischievousness and play in their writing and life set them apart from their contemporaries; as Slobin notes, they were the only two of the leading figures of the time to approach the current religious and philosophical themes with any degree of humour.<sup>18</sup> Their talent and humour gave them a freedom that ensured a more lasting vitality to their writing than that of many of their contemporaries. Even more than Remizov, Rozanov's work has connections with many varied and even contradictory literary phenomena in Russia. While he can be interpreted as an innovator on a par with the futurists, seeking to overcome, even to destroy, traditional literature, he was at the same time the painstaking preserver of obscure and unknown conservative writers. However, in both his radical and conservative stances Rozanov remains constant in his approach to and value for the word.

Rozanov himself constantly asserted his indefinability, resisted categorization and worked to extend the breadth of his future interpretation. He saw definition as an end, a

death, a stifling of the life of the word which should be constantly generating new life and new meaning. He speaks of himself as an unparalleled literary phenomenon, the end and transformation of literary traditions, freeing man from books, yet he simultaneously described himself as part of the most conservative literary tradition, associating his work with writers who remain obscure today, such as Shperk, Romanov (Rtsy) and Govorukha-Otrok; these writers were reverent towards books and written traditions. Rozanov delighted in the juxtaposition of these seemingly contradictory roles, and in the fact that his radicalism, outrageousness and literary caprice could help to promote, as he hoped, the reputations of forgotten conservatives whom he believed were far more exciting and innovative in their writing and ideas than the dull dogmatism of the wrongly named radicals. Rozanov also asserted his links with the earlier Russian literary tradition, with Grigor'ev's 'organic' criticism, Dostoevskii, and isolated figures like Strakhov and Leont'ev. The multiplicity of Rozanov's literary range and influence is already evident by the 1920s, when his writing can be seen to have connections with the decadents and symbolists, futurists and formalists as well as with Russian religious philosophy and earlier literary tradition, mainstream and obscure. In addition, both Mandel'shtam and Tsvetaeva acknowledged an early love for Rozanov's writing, and arguments have even been put forward for Rozanov's influence on their prose style.<sup>19</sup> Perhaps no other writer could claim so broad and

varied an influence at this important transitional time. The range of his enthusiasms and the infectious strength of his language was powerful enough to encompass these many varied inspirations and influences, which have continued to have effect on Russian writing until the present day. Nevertheless, Soviet ideology succeeded in compressing this multiplicity and condemning it as a retrograde subjectivity. The active study and publication of Rozanov was effectively suppressed from the middle of the 1920s to the late 1980s.

Trotskii's 1922 article on Rozanov is characteristic of the Soviet view.<sup>20</sup> Rozanov's principled contradiction is seen as opportunistic compromise, his defence of the intimate philology of the family and home, praised by Mandel'shtam in his article of the same year, is described as a repellent philistine cosiness, a bourgeois fear of the world beyond the warmth and comfort of the interior. Trotskii's criticisms had been anticipated by Struve and Berdiaev in the pre-revolutionary period, and they remained the standard Soviet portrait; the depiction was made more lurid by Belyi's hyperbolic caricature in his tendentious memoir Nachalo veka, of 1933.<sup>21</sup> Soviet criticism portrayed Rozanov as an unprincipled, subjective extremist, pornographic, decadent and monarchist. The rare references to Rozanov in the Soviet period continue in this tone into the 1970s. In 1975 there was a quite extensive article on Rozanov published in Voprosy literatury,<sup>22</sup> which is close in spirit to the usual anti-Rozanov criticism, but

discusses his innovations in form and language. In 1978 the literary journal Kontekst published Gor'kii's notes in his copies of Rozanov's books, and a part of his correspondence with Rozanov.<sup>23</sup> However, there is no doubt a rich unofficial history of Rozanov's reception, and of the life of his work in the Soviet period. Venedikt Erofeev's homage to Rozanov in the book, Glazami ekstsentrika,<sup>24</sup> bears witness to the sort of power Rozanov might have had for independent and creative thinkers in Soviet Russia of the 1960s and 1970s. Rozanovian influence is also evident in his famous Moskva-Petushki.<sup>25</sup> Meanwhile Viktor Sukach, a friend of Erofeev's, was active in compiling a mass of documentation and materials on Rozanov and his life throughout the 1970s and 1980s, not suspecting that his private obsession would become a popular demand. This eventually resulted in the publication, with extensive annotation, of collections of Rozanov's published and unpublished writings such as O sebe i zhizni svoei and Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo... Polnoe sobranie putevykh ocherkov 1899 - 1913 gg.<sup>26</sup> Siniavskii should also be grouped with the Russian 'unofficial' discoverers of Rozanov. Like Erofeev, his work shows both acknowledged and unacknowledged influences. These are most evident in works published after he left the Soviet Union. The collection of thoughts about writing and thinking, Mysli vrasplokh, seems Rozanovian in inspiration. Siniavskii's direct homage to Rozanov, in the book "Opavshie List'ia" V. V. Rozanova, is one of the most complete modern studies of Rozanov



published before the recent renaissance.<sup>27</sup>

The public promotion of Rozanov remained the work of emigré writers and scholars during the Soviet period. Iurii Ivask was perhaps the most prolific Russian Rozanov scholar at this time. He published the first posthumous Russian collection of Rozanov's work, in 1956, with an extended introductory article.<sup>28</sup> He also wrote about Rozanov's relationship with Pavel Florenskii and Konstantin Leont'ev.<sup>29</sup> Novyi zhurnal in New York was the most consistent publisher of Rozanov's writing and related materials; Vestnik Russkogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia published important correspondence. Western writers also began to take an interest in Rozanov's work, notably Renato Poggioli, with his book on Rozanov for Western readers, published in 1957.<sup>30</sup> The study of Rozanov by German readers was promoted by Heinrich Stammeler, who has written several articles in both German and English and a book, devoted to Rozanov's religious philosophy.<sup>31</sup> Attention to Rozanov in England was earlier and less academic. Selective translations of Uedinennoe, Opavshie list'ia and Apokalipsis nashego vremeni by Kotelianskii were published in 1924 and 1929, and Rozanov was drawn to the attention of D. H. Lawrence and W. H. Auden amongst others.<sup>32</sup>

The majority of publications focused on the content of Rozanov's articles as a Russian religious thinker, or categorized him in Western literary histories of Russia solely with the pre-revolutionary decadents and symbolists. Anna Lisa Crone's book Rozanov and the End of Literature,

a reworking of her thesis of 1975, was an attempt to break with what she saw as an approach to Rozanov dominated by discussion of his religious ideas and his biography.<sup>33</sup> She attempts a close textual analysis of the opavshie list'ia genre, based mainly on Shklovskii's formalist approach and Bakhtin's theory of polyphony as expressed in Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo. She discusses the possibilities and effects of Hegelian influence on Rozanov's writing, and suggests links between his literary transformations and futurism. However, her analysis of the eight different 'polyphonic' voices in the opavshie list'ia genre is characterized by a formulaic schematism that seems at odds with Rozanov's work, and a complete lack of ear for the original text in the introduction of characterizations in English such as 'The Practical Homebody' or 'The Russian Buffoon', ugly phrases that jar with the style of the original writing and obstruct rather than refine the reader's perception. While it is important to be as aware as possible of the many varied tones and intonations of Rozanov's writing (the purported aim of the book), the categories here constrain rather than reveal the work and impose Crone's noisy language on Rozanov's own writing. Crone's discussion of Rozanov's writing as the end of literature is more interesting and less schematic than the polyphonic labourings. She links Rozanov's vision of overcoming literature to his imagined descriptions of literature's birth, and shows how Rozanov's anti-literature cannot escape its self-consuming literariness, evoking

Rozanov's sense of being suffocated in literature while it remains his only possible way of breathing.<sup>34</sup>

Recently, the area of Rozanov studies has opened up greatly. There is much more accessible material, both in archives and in the many publications and republications in Russian books and journals. There are many committed new Rozanov scholars in Russia. As well as two extensive collected works in progress,<sup>35</sup> several books have been published on Rozanov, including those by Fateev, Nosov and Pishun and Pishun,<sup>36</sup> and theses are being written. A society for the study of Rozanov has once again been formed and has held Rozanov conferences.<sup>37</sup> Rozanov's work touches on so many different and important aspects of Russian thought and writing that this increased attention, discussion and publication should be exciting and productive.

Rozanov and the Word may seem a rather over-ambitious title for the present study. There are vast aspects of the word and Rozanov that I have not even touched on, yet I think that an awareness of and concern for the Word and words was a central and uniting factor of Rozanov's varied interests and writings. This is as important to an understanding of Rozanov's relationship to the tradition of Russian religious thought as it is to an understanding of his place in the Russian literary tradition; indeed the connection is revealing. The idea of the word as a powerful source of spiritual renewal is central to both traditions, as is the sense of doing battle with ossified, dead words.

The ideal of a living, concentrated energetic word is a constant of Russian religious and literary thought. It is in the approach to the word, more than in the role of religion and literature as preacher and moral reference point, that the essential relation of the two traditions in Russia is made evident. This interconnection between the use of words and human values, religious in the broadest sense, is shown in Mandel'shtam's prose and poems. Mandel'shtam saw that Rozanov, for all his shortcomings as a critic, recognized this crucial connection and devoted all his energy to fuelling the life of the word.<sup>38</sup> This sense of the word is repeatedly described as something inherently Russian. Mirsky repeatedly praised the 'racy russianness' of Rozanov and Remizov, and spoke of their prose as an assertion of the most Russian aspects of the Russian tradition.<sup>39</sup> In 1925 he wrote of the importance of freeing the Russian language from formulaic clichés and outworn literary and 'newspaper' language: 'Каждый за себя должен вновь почувствовать вес и значение слов, сопротивление материала.'<sup>40</sup> He claimed that Rozanov achieved this at a timely moment for the Russian language, as Avvakum had done before him.<sup>41</sup> The sense of a physical, phonetic language suggests the energy of spontaneous speech, but Mirsky points out, as others have later pointed out, that the power of writers such as Avvakum and Rozanov lies precisely in their ability to transform the colloquial and fragmentary spoken language into a supremely literary and conscious creative achievement. They did not merely

break with the limitations of stagnant literary style by reproducing living speech, they gave this speech new and purely literary tasks, and in this interaction between artifice and life they regenerated the language.<sup>12</sup>

This thesis is an attempt to indicate some of the links between the religious and literary implications of Rozanov's work. The first half concentrates on Rozanov's work in the context of Russian traditions of thought and the word, through the writing of Bakhtin, Mandel'shtam, Averintsev and religious thinkers contemporary or near-contemporary to Rozanov, such as Ern and Losev. The second half looks at the context of Rozanov's work, through the writing of, and Rozanov's attitude towards, his friends and colleagues. These were the obscure conservative writers whom Rozanov called the 'literary exiles' (literaturnye izgnanniki) and the more famous and successful 'decadents'. I look at how Rozanov understood his own literary activity in relation to these two traditions, using them as a touchstone for his literary ambitions, and for values that he feared he might be losing. Of course, there are writers and thinkers with whom Rozanov was engaged who are not exemplary of either tradition, and one of them, Solov'ev, is discussed at some length because he was a problematic figure for Rozanov, and occupies an unparalleled amount of space in Rozanov's own writing. The final two chapters of the thesis attempt to understand Rozanov's writing as both a religious and literary activity and as an engagement with the paradoxes of his own self-created role as a writer.

The first half of the thesis begins by relating Rozanov's work to contemporary thought and writing about the word in the Russian religious tradition, using the examples of Ern and Losev in particular. Bakhtin's early writing is introduced in relation to this tradition. While I agree with the wariness of those who oppose the exclusive adoption of Bakhtin as part of the Russian Orthodox tradition, I believe that the juxtaposition of the two, with no further political agenda, is valuable. Equally, reading Rozanov through Bakhtin provides a highly revealing approach to his writing (and to the work of Bakhtin). I look at the genres of solitary self-accounting, confession, prayer, prophecy and iurodstvo, as discussed in Bakhtin's Avtor i geroi v esteticheskoi deiatel'nosti,<sup>43</sup> in relation to Rozanov's opavshie list'ia genre. The second chapter looks at questions of form, intonation, resistance of definition, silence, approaches to knowledge and the importance of litso in the Russian tradition of the word. In the third chapter Bakhtin's theory of the familiar and intimate genre as a way to break with established literary canons is discussed in relation to Rozanov's work. Bakhtin insisted on the interrelationship between life and art in almost all verbal activity. Thus this break with existing canons is described by him in terms both literary and political. Rozanov's acute sensitivity to the use of words in life and literature enabled him both to lay bare the pretensions of his enemies as well as to persuade by the power of his language rather than by factual proof. His

work is discussed as a form of Bakhtin's intimate genre, challenging and even replacing previously received literary canons and assumed authorities in existing writing. Rozanov's principled self-contradiction was a deflation of false certainties, received ideas and literary pomposity. It demanded a new active response to reading, and thus to writing, and Bakhtin and Rozanov would both argue, towards life. I look at Rozanov's relation to the reader in the context both of Bakhtinian ideas and of Mandel'shtam's prose writing. Mandel'shtam's prose essays, similarly to Bakhtin's writing, can be read in the tradition of thought about and concern for the word in Russian culture.<sup>44</sup> The final chapter of part one looks at the use of letters, handwriting and manuscripts, print and the press in relation to Rozanov's literary battle for a living word.

Ideas of the renewal of the word in literature link Rozanov's writing not only to that of modernist prose and to the acmeists and futurists, but equally connect him with the obscure conservative tradition of the group that Rozanov called the 'literary exiles'. The first chapter of part two, looks at Rozanov's relationship with these writers, Strakhov and Leont'ev, Romanov (Rtsy), Shperk, Govorukha-Otrok and others. I have concentrated on the way in which Rozanov presents their writings in terms that relate to the first part of the thesis; as a series of approaches to the spoken and written, uttered or unuttered words. Through his attention to these writers, Rozanov concentrates on aspects of manuscript, printed,

'disembodied' words and words situated in an immediate transient context, the physical concrete presence of words, verbal intonation, and words as prayer or breath. These ideas are as important as aspects of the tradition of Russian religious thought as they are to ideas about the word that became a part of the acmeist and futurist movements. Much of Rozanov's extremely innovatory writing consciously allies itself with Russian traditions against the supposedly modern and radical fashions of thought. The very modern form of the opavshie list'ia genre, which was at least in part the result of unlikely obscure conservative influences such as that of Romanov (Rtsy) and Leont'ev, has had lasting innovative effects on Russian writing. In the second part I also look at Rozanov's relationship with other figures, such as Vladimir Solov'ev, and the 'decadents'; in particular Merezhkovskii, Gippius and Blok. Rozanov's attitudes towards these writers is again approached through what he understood to be their relation to the word. Chapter VII looks briefly at sectarianism and apocalypse as a literary phenomenon, and at Rozanov's personal demonstration of these dominating contemporary themes in his writing. The final chapter discusses Rozanov's attempts to resolve his relation to words, writing and existence in the opavshie list'ia genre. Rozanov's works are themselves the result of an extremely literary consciousness, which, like the writing of the hero of Dostoevskii's Zapiski iz podpol'ia, was unable to escape the awareness of its literary nature, despite being a bid



to overcome this and speak spontaneously, free from reference or consciousness of example. Yet in his opavshie list'ia genre, Rozanov himself created a form that has penetrated deeply into the Russian literary consciousness. I look at the conflict between this self-conscious literariness and the sense of constant utterance, and constant writing, as a religious need, or as the only possible way of living when God remains silent.

I hope that the present study approaches Rozanov to some degree in the spirit in which he approached the writers that he loved, with excitement and an ear for the tones and intonations of speech in the writing, and for what is left unspoken. I am sure that Rozanov's influence will be found to be important in many ways that have not been indicated in this thesis but I hope that the present work, not least through the quotation of the original writing, may spark off connections that I have not anticipated and enthusiasm for the value of reading Rozanov.

PART ONECHAPTER I: THE TRADITION OF THE WORD IN RUSSIAN THOUGHT:ROZANOV AND BAKHTINASPECTS OF THE TRADITION OF THE WORD IN LATE NINETEENTH AND  
EARLY TWENTIETH CENTURY RUSSIA

Rozanov was writing at a time when the debate on the word was carried on with intensity in Russia. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the word contained potentially far more than a purely stylistic function, it was fraught with implications. The word in Russian, slovo, itself had a resonance beyond the mere indication of a vehicle for the translation of meaning. It had religious, philosophical and political resonance. Writers and thinkers emphasized the need to restore this living word, in religion, literary and political life. There was a call for an active and true use of the word that was free of cliché and hypocrisy. Any debate on writing could not avoid engaging with the broader philosophical tradition of the word. In Russia, this meant engaging with the word's sacred inheritance.

The dominant tradition in Russian philosophical thought understood language as implicitly religious, God-given. Yet the Russian verbal and religious tradition eschews abstraction and is very much a part of the physical world; this is affirmed by a strong awareness of the concrete presence of words as sound in both religious and

secular usage. Mandel'shtam claimed that this strength of the Russian language lay in its Hellenic origins:

Русский язык - язык эллинистический. В силу целого ряда исторических условий, живые силы эллинской культуры, уступив запад латинским влияниям и не надолго загнивая в бездетной Византии, устремились в лоно русской речи, сообщив ей самоуверенную тайну эллинистического мировоззрения, тайну свободного воплощения, и поэтому русский язык стал именно звучащей и говорящей плотью.<sup>1</sup>

Mandel'shtam emphasizes the word's phonetic presence as tangible and resonant flesh. Averintsev has also described the central role of the word in Hellenic and Near Eastern verbal traditions as formative of the Russian verbal tradition.<sup>2</sup> He contrasts the supremely literary and written culture of the Greeks with the Near Eastern, Judaic traditions of prophecy and prayer, where energy is concentrated in the moment of utterance, not in written vestiges. Yet for both cultures the living word is the centre of attention: 'Конечно, греческий пиетет перед литературной классикой и пиетет перед Священным писанием - вещи различные, почти противоположные; но и там и здесь в центр культуры и жизни ставится то, что выговорено в слове.'<sup>3</sup>

The word confers sacral power in the Russian tradition, but it also imposes historical responsibility. The word as the central source of value demands a sharpened

accountability to the use of language in the here and now. Mandel'shtam claimed that a separation from this living sense of language would mean historical death: 'столь органический язык не только дверь в историю, но и сама история. Для России отпадением от истории <...> было бы отпадение от языка. «Онемение» двух, трех поколений могло бы привести к исторической смерти.'<sup>4</sup> He describes language as an active event: 'Эллинистическую природу русского языка можно отождествлять с его бытийственностью. Слово в эллинистическом понимании есть плоть деятельная, разрешающаяся в событие.'<sup>5</sup> Mandel'shtam's writing on the role of the word can be compared with Bakhtin's description of the word as a constant historical accountability.<sup>6</sup> The juxtaposition of slovo and sobytie was crucial to Bakhtin's writing on verbal creation.<sup>7</sup> The word is understood as a deed. Man performs an act of speech, and no words, even the words of the past, are inert if they are spoken or read anew. In Bakhtin's view, the word participates in the event of Being from the unique and specific situation of time and place in which it is uttered. From his earliest writings onwards, Bakhtin argued the need for constant verbal activity to renew the world that exists, to release it from its givenness, which he saw as a stasis and loss of life. The word is an event, enacted by the speaker on the givenness of his existence, thus it is a momentary release from this givenness, a temporary freedom for the speaker and for the world as it participates in his act of utterance. The world is renewed in as far as it is uttered,

and yet having been uttered, it suffers a loss of life, a completion, through words, in definition. For the world to live in the fullness of ever possible new interpretations, there must be a continual recreation of existence in new words, or in a reutterance of old words, in order to revivify this completed existence. Bakhtin warned against the tyranny of finalizing words or concepts, he demanded a constant reinterpretation, a constant verbal activity that it was our duty to engage in. Arguing from a basis of Neo-Kantian concepts of givenness, he calls for a repeated enactment on the given world in words, to overcome the hopelessness of the present world and open it up to new possibilities and various futures. In the essay Avtor i geroi v esteticheskoi deiatel'nosti, Bakhtin speaks in terms that have a religious philosophical resonance. Like Mandel'shtam, he puts the word in the biblical context of the Word made flesh. The present world in its finalized utterance is a 'dead flesh' which must be renewed by a constant incarnation through utterance:

<...> действительный мир (в отвлечении [от] предстоящего и заданного, еще не изреченного) есть уже изреченный, уже высказанный смысл события бытия, мир в своей наличности есть выраженность, уже сказанное, уже прозвучавшее слово. <...> Пока слово не было сказано, можно было верить и надеяться - ведь предстояла такая нудительная полнота смысла <...>. Уже сказанное слово звучит безнадежно в своей уже-произнесенности; сказанное слово - смертная плоть

смысла. Бытие, уже наличное в прошлом и настоящем, - только смертная плоть предстоящего смысла события бытия - абсолютного будущего.<sup>8</sup>

New utterance re-enacts the Word made flesh and opens up new possibilities of meaning, in response to the original incarnation. Both Mandel'shtam and Bakhtin's writings on the Word quoted here, written in the 1920s, show the influence of Russian religious traditions, in which there had been a resurgence of interest in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Such an intense focus on Russian traditions of language and thought was at least in part an attempt at national self-definition: to affirm the specific features of Russian thought in the face of European philosophy, which was seen to have reached a crisis point. It was stimulated by a disenchantment with the limitations of an overly rationalist European philosophy, and a new urgency about the need to stake out a specifically Russian way of thinking.

Dostoevskii's writing was an important source of reference for thinkers, not least for Rozanov, at this time. His novels engaged with the contemporary conflicts between what was seen as a rationalist European legacy of thought and a more organic, religious, Russian approach. They exposed the precariousness of the situation in which people were brought up entirely within structures borrowed from a foreign culture on the verge of spiritual bankruptcy. In Dnevnik pisatel'ia, Dostoevskii wrote that

European languages were limited by their finished forms and unyielding to innovation in words or thought. The Russian language possessed immense potential for the expression of as yet unrealized thoughts. It thus offered a way out of the intellectual and linguistic impasse of European culture. Dostoevskii described the Russian language as a paradigm proof of the nation's historic potential:

Ведь страшно сказать, что европейский дух, может-быть, не так многообразен и более замкнуто-своеобразен, чем наш, несмотря даже на то, что уж несомненно законченнее и отчетливее выразился, чем наш. Но если это страшно сказать, то, по крайней мере, нельзя не признать, с надеждой и с веселием духа, что нашего-то языка дух - бесспорно многообразен, богат, всесторонен и всеобъемлющ, ибо в неустроенных еще формах своих, а уже мог передать драгоценности и сокровища мысли европейской, и мы чувствуем, что переданы они точно и верно.'

Mandel'shtam also describes European languages as constrained by the boundaries and formal limitations of the Western cultural tradition. He insists on the immense vitality of the Russian language:

Если западные культуры и истории замыкают язык извне, огораживают его стенами государственности и церковности и пропитываются им, чтобы медленно гнить и зацвести в должный час его распада, русская культура и история со всех

сторон омута и опоясана грозной и безбрежной стихией русского языка, не вмещающегося ни в какие государственные и церковные формы.<sup>10</sup>

Both writers identify the limitations of European languages with those of European culture; the degeneration of the language is inextricably bound up with that of the culture. By the late nineteenth century Europe's role as a symbolic source of progress and innovation for Russia seemed threatened. Russian writers perceived in Europe a sense of intellectual and spiritual pessimism, a loss of direction and a threat of decline. These anxieties were embodied by characters in Dostoevskii's writing, such as Versilov in the novel Podrostok. He describes the educated Russian as a wanderer (skitalets) in Europe.<sup>11</sup> Dostoevskii believed that the Russian had one advantage from subsisting always on borrowed cultural and intellectual ideas; he remains free from the cushioning habits that entrenched cultural tradition can become, and he can perceive more sharply the crisis that it conceals. The Russian wanderer not only becomes the consciousness (and conscience) of Europe, but feels this crisis, the conflict between ideals and formal stagnation, most acutely in himself.

Dostoevskii argued that it was Russia's role to show Europe what she most dangerously lacks, and for want of which her entire culture was in atrophy. The attempts of the next generation of writers and thinkers to define the specifically Russian characteristics of language, thought



and religion was an affirmation of national individuality from within a country that has itself been described as pursuing an adolescent quest for identity, exemplified in the title of Dostoevskii's book, Podrostok.<sup>12</sup>

Vladimir Solov'ev achieved a turning point for Russian thought with his Kritika otvlechennykh nachal of 1880, a critique of the limitations of Western philosophy and indication of Russia's original potential inspired in part by the early Slavophiles, Kireevskii and Khomiakov. The interest in Russia's own philosophical tradition became particularly intense at the turn of the century. The philosopher Vladimir Ern was particularly representative of the Russian attempt at intellectual self-definition. Ern argued that the intense involvement of Russian thought with Western European philosophy was not an imitative dependence, but a stimulus to the development of original Russian traditions of thinking and of the word:

Глубокое внимание к западной мысли, исключительная заинтересованность всеми продуктами философского творчества Европы и в то же время, можно сказать, субстанциальная пронизанность религией Слова, роднящей нас с «логизмом» восточнохристианского умозрения, - вот что составляет поистине оригинальную почву русской философской мысли, почву, которая объясняет и все особенности русской философии от Сковороды до кн. С. Н. Трубецкого и открывает для дальнейшего философского творчества в России безбрежные перспективы.<sup>13</sup>

Ern characterized the distinctive nature of Russian philosophical thought by three fundamental tendencies:

1. The avoidance of abstract concepts and systems that falsify life and thought:

Форма и содержание мысли нераздельны. Мысль, которая игнорирует свои содержания, сиюсь от них отвлечься, <...> впадает в ложную отвлеченность от жизни <...>. Русская философская мысль в противоположность этому рационалистическому стремлению к дурной отвлеченности была всегда существенно конкретна <...>. Она же обуславливает любопытную черту: отсутствие систем. <...> Русские мыслители заняты самой мыслью, а не ее искусственным обрамлением.<sup>14</sup>

2. In the West, while philosophers themselves may be deeply religious, philosophical enquiry is restricted to the intellectually ascertainable. Russian thought is based on a premise of religious faith. Language is God-given: 'Осознание Логоса есть сознание Божества. Всякое осознание Логоса поэтому существенно религиозно. Отсюда второй основной чертой русской философской мысли является глубокая и коренная религиозность.'<sup>15</sup>

3. Understanding is seen as a dynamic ascesis, carried on as a response to life, not in scholastic isolation. Discoveries in thought should depend on one's entire way of

living and should likewise affect one's life: 'всякое, даже самое отдаленное и приближенное, сознание Логоса предполагает как свое необходимое условие сверхобычную напряженность личной жизни, повышенное онтологически-жизненное самосознание'.<sup>16</sup>

In Russian thought man's use of the word is closely linked to his individual existence, which was sacred. The question of language and individual identity was important to thinkers who were contemporaries and near contemporaries of Rozanov. Diverse thinkers such as Ern, Losev, Florenskii and Bakhtin shared a common premise about the relation between individual nature, words and responsibility. The ideas of Lik, litso, and lichina are crucial for any discussion of the Russian tradition of the word. They demonstrate emphatically the impossibility of separating word from flesh, of making words into concepts abstracted from their specific embodiment and situatedness. For Rozanov and Bakhtin this tradition of the word makes itself felt in an insistence on the unrepeatable nature of each existence and the indefinable nature of man and of his utterance.<sup>17</sup> In the Russian religious tradition the word Lik represents the divine image that is present in all men. Rozanov entitled his book on Christian metaphysics Temnyi lik. In as much as we answer to this divine image, or Lik, that we contain, we fulfil the demands of our own particular nature, our litso and lichnost'. However, if we deny this accountability, we do not fulfil our nature and

are limited to a false face, or lichina, a mask that stifles our divinely created image. Value for the word, whose origin is in the divine Word, parallels this idea: the original divine word, Logos, and the original divine image, Lik, are made manifest in transitory, everyday incarnations of human lives and language. Our responsibility to this original source is to complete our nature through acts of language. In the tradition of Russian thought, we are responsible to our nature in our deeds, our physical and verbal incursions on the world. In speaking we answer, or fail to answer, to our origin, and to the origin of all speech. All utterance is thus in some way a reckoning with the supreme source of words, which is God. The word litso is used both to indicate the face, the part of the body most closely bound to God since it is the centre of verbal and emotional expression, and the entire individual. Ern writes of the connection between the divine Word and the individual:

Мудрость Слова не может быть дана помимо личности. Она раскрывается через личность и в личности.<sup>18</sup>

<...> личность в атмосфере логизма, естественно, занимает центральное место <...>. В логизме Бог - Личность, Вселенная - Личность, Церковь - Личность, человек - Личность. <...> человек в глубочайшей тайне своего личного бытия, в непостижимом зерне своей индивидуальности гораздо ближе и существеннее постигает модус существования Бога и

Мира, чем применяя периферическое, совершенно бессмысленное и отвлеченное понятие мертвенной вечности.<sup>19</sup>

Ern emphasizes our responsibility to the particularity of our existence in the individuality of our words.<sup>20</sup> The Russian tradition recognizes the specific task of each life, as expressed in words, physical expressions, and actions, a task that is both a responsibility and freedom. Losev described the importance of these ideas in Russian thought, and illustrates his argument with extensive quotation from Ern's book on Skovoroda.<sup>21</sup> Ern, Losev indicates, valued Skovoroda's transferral of eternal and abstract metaphysical qualities to the unrepeatable individuality of man. In Dialektika mifa, Losev describes the central importance of expression in the formation of one's true character or lichnost'. Like Ern he maintains that true individual existence develops in a constant process of physical and verbal expression in response to the original source of the Word, Logos, and the divine image, Lik. In the physical expressions of his face, his gestures and his speech, man attempts to overcome the imprisonment of a purely subjective existence by expressing himself to the outside world. Human expression, both bodily and verbal, reveals the tension of inner and outer existence that makes up the active life of every individual:

Наблюдая хорошо знакомое выражение лица человека, которого

вы давно знаете, вы обязательно видите не просто внешность лица <...>. Вы видите здесь обязательно нечто внутреннее, - однако так, что оно дано только через внешнее, и это нисколько не мешает непосредственности такого созерцания. Итак, личность есть всегда выражение, а потому принципиально - и символ. Но самое главное - это то, что личность есть обязательно осуществленный символ и осуществленная интеллигенция. <...> Личность ест ф а к т. Она существует в и с т о р и и. Она живет, борется, порождается, расцветает и умирает. Она есть всегда обязательно жизнь, а не чистое понятие. Чистое понятие должно быть осуществлено, овеществлено, материализовано. Оно должно предстать с живым телом и органами. Личность есть всегда телесно данная интеллигенция, телесно осуществленный символ.<sup>22</sup>

Rozanov's writing is at times a very specific interpretation of this Russian tradition of the physical incarnation of the Word.<sup>23</sup> In the Russian tradition the living language can be as spontaneous, diverse, robust and prolific as creation itself, but this does not deny its God-givenness. The world is seething with immanent linguistic potential through which man can respond to God's world in speech. The religion of the Word is unlike Western philosophical systems in that it demands individual effort which is not merely intellectual. One is accountable with one's whole existence, as Bakhtin emphasized: 'в едином и единственном событии бытия нельзя быть нейтральным'.<sup>24</sup>

Vladimir Ern had described this situation thus:

В самодовольстве пребывают те, кто думает, что мысль действительна только за кабинетным столом. Когда Слово, проникая внутрь, завладевает всей полнотой человеческих переживаний, оно выражает себя не пером и не одними устами, а божественной глубиной и мукой искания, соразмерного значительности мысли - индивидуализирующего эту мысль и движущего всею жизнью избранника.

От этого мысль не затемняется, как думают рационалисты, а углубляется, не гибнет, а растет.<sup>25</sup>

In the essay of 1918, 'Russkaia filosofiia', Losev claims that Russian philosophy demands imagination and individual engagement. Russian philosophy is inextricably bound up with real life, and this is why it often appears in the form of journalism that participates in the spirit and chaos of the time:

Русская философия неразрывно связана с действительной жизнью, поэтому она часто является в виде публицистики, которая берет начало в общем духе времени, со всеми его положительными и отрицательными сторонами, со всеми его радостями и страданиями, со всем его порядком и хаосом.

Поэтому среди русских очень мало философов *par excellence*: они есть, они гениальны, но зачастую их приходится искать среди фельетонистов, литературных критиков и теоретиков отдельных партий.<sup>26</sup>

Losev adds that literature is also integral to the Russian philosophical tradition. The insights obtained in Russian literature go far beyond merely literary or artistic considerations. Philosophy and literature are closely linked in the Russian tradition. A secular literature was itself a recent development. Writing had emerged from a predominantly sacral tradition. In the nineteenth century secular literature did not lose this aura of sanctity, of possessing transformative powers. Both in the revolutionary and religious traditions in Russia, the sacred nature of the word is vital to an understanding of the ways in which many writers in Russia in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries understood their task. Anatolii Naiman has argued that Russia's dependence on the word is rooted in these sacred origins of its written language. Writing not only had a transformative potential, but could create its own literary reality, distinct from the reality of life:

The specific status that literature enjoyed in Russia, including within itself religion, politics, philosophy and social thought, and assuming the functions of preacher, teacher, judge and legislator, turned it into a kind of second reality, quite often more immediate and actual than real life.<sup>27</sup>



ROZANOV'S WRITING AND THE RUSSIAN TRADITION OF THE WORD

Writing within this tradition, which conferred such a high importance and moral seriousness on words, Rozanov could be seen as a maverick figure, continually avoiding responsibility for his words and asserting an extreme and multiple subjectivity in a time still resonant with objective truths. Rozanov's ability to write from many viewpoints, his contempt for morality and his principled self-contradiction seem to be persuading a radical relativity at odds with Dostoevskii's demands for moral seriousness in the task of enriching the intellectual potential of the language. Critics saw his attitude as flippant, devious and perverse. Yet Rozanov exemplifies the combination of journalist, literary critic and autonomous philosopher that Losev described as typical of Russian philosophy, only his art lay in exploding these very definitions by his exploitation of their nature. Despite claiming to despise journalism, Rozanov made use of his own journalistic role to promote a constant contradictoriness which both laid bare the ephemeral quality of the powerful and revered journals and had a serious philosophical intent. Rozanov's relativity was, he claimed, his method. He was continually questioning his own writing processes and aims. The self-contradiction, fragmentary, aphoristic and 'spoken' forms of expression had important consequences for the dominant forms of thought and literary exposition.

Although Western critics, following the formalists,

have concentrated more on Rozanov's innovations in style and genre, Rozanov's religious writing was valued by contemporary and near-contemporary religious thinkers: Pavel Florenskii, Ern, Shestov and Losev among others.<sup>28</sup> It is true, as the formalists demonstrated, that Rozanov's writing had a very important stylistic influence on Russian literature. Yet his legacy was as much in the opening up of new expressive possibilities for thought as it was purely 'literary' or stylistic. Rozanov's writing was radically innovative in both form and content. Those that loved him and learnt from his writing found him neither frivolous nor unprincipled. His challenged to received ideas in literature was motivated by the intensity of his search. Rozanov was as concerned as Dostoevskii about Russia's fate and about his role in it as a writer. He claimed that Dostoevskii's Dnevnik pisatel'ia was his constant reading ('nastol'naia kniga').<sup>29</sup> Rozanov is answering Dostoevskii's summons for writers to take up the challenge of the Russian language, to explore new possibilities of thought through this language. As D. S. Mirsky emphasizes, Rozanov created a distinctly 'Russian' literary language: 'The poetry of the symbolists was very largely conditioned by foreign influences; <...>. The parallel development in Russian prose was, on the contrary, <...> an assertion of the most Russian aspects of the Russian tradition. Rozanov's radically new and vernacular treatment of literary Russian gave the keynote.'<sup>30</sup> Rozanov introduced not only words, but also subjects that had hitherto been considered

'unliterary', and was accused of a shameless egoism and triviality. However, it is not a case of serious spiritual intent betrayed by capriciousness or innovation for its own sake. Even Rozanov's most flagrant defiance of literary taste, his lack of moral principle and unorthodox eccentricities can be understood within the context of the Russian religious tradition of language and attitude towards God. Mirsky defends Rozanov's stylistic innovations, but also writes that Rozanov's insight into religion and human character was more profound even than Dostoevskii's.<sup>31</sup> Rozanov fuelled the tradition of language as spiritual expression and opened up new possibilities for this expression. His writing revealed a daring new approach to God and to one's own spiritual questioning, and ways of addressing the problems of man's relationship to God and to his world that appear remote from traditional forms of prayer. Yet Rozanov understood his writing as both prayer and prophecy. The possibilities for expression, rooted far more in the individual, the fragmentary and everyday, were particularly powerful at a time when the difficulties of belief had become increasingly fraught.

Rozanov's writing, although highly idiosyncratic, embodies the characteristics of Russian thought as described by Losev and Ern, in its philosophical approach, form, and language. Rozanov wanted to go beyond the limitations of rational enquiry to ask questions that concerned man's emotional and spiritual life and his relation to God. He believes that this enquiry should not

be limited to writing, but that it should penetrate the whole of man's conscious existence. In a review of a book by Pobedonostsev, Rozanov criticized the theoretical approach of the intellect that shuts out the creative power of emotive instinct. This instinct was both religious and rooted in life:

Инстинкт - верит, потому что он есть; ум - не верит, потому что он только видит, что кто-то есть, и не знает точных границ этого «есть» <...>. Жизнь, история - непременно творятся верою; без веры - ни шагу <...>. Я повторяю, что вера есть просто великое ощущение сердцем избытка в себе бытия - того что оно просто есть <...>.<sup>32</sup>

Rozanov rarely used language in an abstract way. His thought and writing exemplify the dynamic sense of existence (byt'iistvennost') of the Russian tradition of the Word. As the Russian philosopher Frank wrote:

Розанов обладает неподражаемым даром совершенно безыскусственного, произвольного, замечательного нелитературного выражения мыслей. Слово есть у него не искусственное орудие выражения отвлеченного содержания мысли, а как бы живое адекватное воплощение конкретного душевного процесса мышления во всей его непосредственности.<sup>33</sup>

Rozanov sought to capture the immediacy of thought,

unconstrained by conventional literary organization. This was the basis of his innovations in the literary language, and in form, as in the opavshie list'ia genre. The radically modern results can nevertheless be understood in the context of the Russian philosophical approach to the Word.

#### ROZANOV, BAKHTIN AND THE RUSSIAN TRADITION OF THE WORD

The Russian religious tradition of the word was an important part of Bakhtin's early experience. He was highly aware of this tradition. He had been drawn to religious and philosophical groups such as Voskresenie and Volfila, where he was engaged with religious thinkers such as Meier, Askol'dov and Fedotov.<sup>34</sup> The influence of Russian religious ideas is particularly evident in Bakhtin's early work, Avtor i geroi v esteticheskoi deiatel'nosti. Yet thoughts about language from this work persist in Bakhtin's last writings, and still have a certain religious resonance: 'Слово как средство (язык) и слово как осмысление. Осмысливающее слово принадлежит к царству целей. Слово как последняя (высшая) цель.'<sup>35</sup>

Bakhtin furthered the inheritance of Russian thought in a way that reached far beyond the specifically Russian and religious context from which it emerged. Yet it could be argued it was a specifically Russian approach to the word that was the source of his writing's continual vitality. There are implications of religious ideas

throughout his work,<sup>36</sup> particularly in the central idea of his early writing of language as existing in acts (deeds) of speech between people in a specifically situated context that is encompassed and guaranteed by an all-comprehending God. Bakhtin's early work concentrated on man's linguistic activity as a continual answering to God. In it, the use of language to further thought is never far from prayer. Man may be in dialogue with himself, with another, but he is also communicating to God, the ultimate goal. Clark and Holquist call it 'an attempt to understand and describe a world in which prayer makes sense'.<sup>37</sup> In Bakhtin's combination of religious and Neo-Kantian approaches to the relationship between the subject and the world, words are a central deed: 'Human consciousness enters the world through deeds in the form of acts that define values, or through 'outgoing words' (iskhodiashchie slova).'<sup>38</sup> The world which Bakhtin describes is one in which the sense of God as interlocutor, addressee or referent and witness is always present.

In Avtor i geroi v esteticheskoi deiatel'nosti, Bakhtin examines the individual utterance in the form of solitary self-accounting, confession, prayer, prophecy and even iurodstvo. These all are a part of a specifically Orthodox tradition, and his analysis should be read within the context of Russian traditions of approach to God in words. Again, these are themes that remained important in his thought in the late notes of 1970-71.<sup>39</sup> Bakhtin also explores these ideas with extensive reference to

Dostoevskii, who was a formative influence in his exploration of the varied forms of religious verbal expression, located in an explicitly literary, aesthetic context. These categories of verbal expression are valuable for an approximation of the nature of Rozanov's own genre, that of the opavshie list'ia, as a literary activity that nevertheless seeks to go beyond the limitations of literature, that is closer to prayer or prophecy, that appeals to God and sets itself apart from the traditional literary audience.

A religious approach to Rozanov's literary genre was made by contemporaries and later generations. Rozanov's writing has been variously described as confession, prayer, 'prophetism', and 'iurodstvo'. He has been described as a Dostoevskian 'underground man', and a Karamazov, and is recognized as a supremely Russian phenomenon, embodying the various eccentricities of Russian approaches to God and to religious questions, on the edges of Orthodoxy. Yet the link between Rozanov and Bakhtin is stronger than a chance association. Although Bakhtin's references to Rozanov in his published work are restricted to a brief mention of Rozanov as critic of Dostoevskii in his Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo,<sup>40</sup> it is known that he admired Rozanov and knew his writing well. Indeed when the young disciples who initiated Bakhtin's 'rediscovery' in the 1960s asked him what books they must read he replied, 'Read Rozanov'.<sup>41</sup> Bakhtin's interest in Orthodox Christianity drew him into close contact with Florenskii who was also a close friend

of Rozanov and who was influenced by his literary example. Clark and Holquist maintain that there are significant parallels between the thought of Bakhtin and Florenskii.<sup>42</sup> However, the differences between the two are also important. Bakhtin's emphasis on the physical world, the here and now, feasts and the body, continual utterance and the resistance of final definition are far closer to Rozanov than to the other-worldly Florenskii. Bakhtin's emphasis on outsideness and otherness was in direct contrast to Florenskii's aim at an ultimate union, where 'two will be one'. Bakhtin celebrated the multiplicity of immediate everyday experience and was suspicious of ultimate transcendence.<sup>43</sup> Rozanov had attacked Florenskii for his indifference to human, earthly love.<sup>44</sup> Like Rozanov, Bakhtin was suspicious of all forms of dogma and authoritarianism that could detract from the immediate experience of life, and this included Orthodoxy. Both men were drawn to the transient details of life itself and the power of the passing word. Bakhtin's writings are of course aiming at something quite different than Rozanov's opavshie list'ia, he was far more scholarly and cosmopolitan in his erudition. Bakhtin was wary of the 'free-thinking' religious questioning of Russian thought,<sup>45</sup> but the two men shared fundamental approaches to life and words. Bakhtin had met Rozanov but he spoke little of his impressions and declared only that in appearance Rozanov was the most ordinary looking 'meshchanin'.<sup>46</sup>

Rozanov's opavshie list'ia genre, that began with the



publication of Uedinennoe in 1912, shocked readers by its contempt for the conventional forms of address to the reader, its casual familiarity, and principled self-absorption. However, this writing had a serious intent. It is helpful to look at Rozanov's writing and his own evaluations of his writing through the discussion of writing and self-expression in Bakhtin's early work. Bakhtin's description of the dialogic situation which is the paradigm for verbal situations in literature and life contains three participants: the speaker, source of the utterance, the other who is addressed in immediate time, and a third participant, who can be imagined as God, an unknown future reader, or a focus of ultimate appeal such as the judgement of history or the human conscience.<sup>47</sup> This third consciousness is a guarantee of the value of what is spoken, a guarantee of a true understanding in time, in spite of the possible misinterpretations of the immediate situation. In Avtor i geroi v esteticheskoi deiatel'nosti, Bakhtin analysed in detail the instances of relationship between man's speech and the other that he addresses, whether this other is a contemporary or an absolute, such as God. He describes the transition from solitary self-accounting to religious genres, confession, prayer, and sacred naivety. The prominence of these genres in Bakhtin's first formulations of a philosophy of utterance and self-expression in literary and extra-literary contexts is not accidental. Bakhtin was responding to a tradition that he was engaged in. He believed in the central importance of

the sacred forms of verbal expression, the need to speak to something beyond the immediate human presence. He recognized the persistence of the human need for appeal, for prayer, self-accounting and utterance, as a part of the life of consciousness. Bakhtin shows how the isolated consciousness that speaks is an impossibility. He is explicit about its religious origin: 'Вне бога, вне доверия к абсолютной дружости невозможно самоосознание и самовысказывание <...> доверие к Богу - имманентный конститутивный момент чистого самоосознания и самовыражения.'<sup>48</sup>

Rozanov can also be understood within this tradition of religious utterance. He demonstrates the conflicts involved in finding a way of expression that was both spiritual and literary. Both Rozanov and Bakhtin look to Dostoevskii for original examples of literary confessional self-accounting, self-condemnation, prophecy, *iurodstvo*, and religious questioning of God. Rozanov writes in many different tones within these forms of address; he is angry, challenging, reproachful, beseeching, playful, praying, prophetic. His writing is indeed a 'fugue', as he wrote to Pertsov,<sup>49</sup> containing a whole range of emotions about himself, his reader and God. Rozanov has recourse to traditions of the word that he finds threatened, such as an individual spontaneous spirit of prayer and prophecy. His resurrection of these traditions is a response to this imminent loss. However, it also provides him with a peculiarly new form of writing, as literature. The

tradition that he borrows from allows him to break with existing patterns of literary form and address to produce writing that is extremely modern, both in its formal and organizational freedom and in its intimate and introspective reply to living in words.

#### 'UEDINENNOE' - SPEAKING IN SOLITUDE

Bakhtin describes solitary self-accounting as a bid to get to the truth of oneself by denying an immediate interlocutor. Yet this process cannot be carried on in self-referential isolation. Bakhtin writes that the denial of an immediate audience pushes the subject out towards an absolute other. By speaking, even for a distant other, the subject breaks free from the confines of his subjectivity and enters into the fray of life. Utterance is the point at which the subject lays bare his subjectivity for evaluation and completion by an other:

Отрицание здешнего оправдания переходит в нужду в оправдании религиозном; он полон нужды в прощении и искуплении как абсолютно чистом даре <...> Это оправдание не имманентно самоотчету, но лежит за границами его, в непредопределенном рискованном будущем действительного события <...> сами просьба и мольба остаются открытыми, незавершенными, они как бы обрываются в непредопределенное будущее события.<sup>50</sup>

In a very similar way Emmanuel Levinas states that: 'By offering a word, the subject putting himself forward lays himself open and, in a sense, prays.'<sup>51</sup> Solitary self-accounting and prayer is a form of this self-exposure which attempts to preserve the highest degree of subjectivity, seeking refuge in an other who is the repository of ultimate values, but who will never speak. Solitary self-accounting is an evasion of the intrusion of the random evaluation of another consciousness. The other's immediate presence can act as a completing of the utterance, a defining. Avoidance of the immediate other is an attempt to preserve one's own indefinability, to maintain a continuous creativity of speech, without having to reckon with the listener's judgement. Thus the attempt at self-understanding is best carried on when words are uttered for an absolute other, at whom one can pitch one's words without fear of an immediate evaluation. At this degree of introspection, the immediate other's evaluation becomes an imposition, clouding the process of self-elucidation. In the process of self-accounting Bakhtin describes a wilful distancing from the immediate contemporary audience which constitutes a potential threat to the purity of the writer's relationship to himself, and thus to the truth of his words: 'Чистое ценностно одинокое отношение к себе самому - таков предел, к которому стремится самоотчет-исповедь, преодолевая все трансгredientные моменты оправдания и оценки, возможные в сознании других людей <...>.'<sup>52</sup> Thus, in Bakhtinian terms, Rozanov's denial of

his reader on the opening page of Uedinennoe is an attempt to free himself from any obligation to the immediate addressee, to attempt a pure self-exploration, free from the possible evaluations of other imagined onlookers or judges:

<...> Ах, добрый читатель, я уже давно пишу «без читателя»,  
- просто потому что нравится. Как «без читателя» и издаю...  
<...>.

Ну, читатель, не церемонюсь я с тобой, - можешь и ты не церемониться со мной:

- К черту...

- К черту!

И au-revoir до встречи на том свете. С читателем гораздо скучнее, чем одному.

[Ued.: 36]

'Writing for oneself' denies a temporal completion in the reception of another, but is thus all the more in need of an absolute receiver, reader or listener. Bakhtin describes the transition from solitary self-accounting, through degrees of confession, and self-condemnation, towards a direct appeal to God, in prayer and prophecy. He argues that, in the search for freedom from immediate addressees, for the purity of self-relationship, the subject is forced into a recognition that this is not enough, and his cry turns outwards, towards an ultimate

judge and witness of his solitude, towards God.<sup>53</sup> Without this ultimate source of appeal, utterance would be senseless. Despite what he claimed, Rozanov was never writing purely for himself. Yet the renunciation of responsibility to the immediate reader created a much needed freedom for speech, in which the emphasis in Rozanov's writing can shift to the 'unknown' but intimate readers in time, and to God. Rozanov's emphasis on his extreme subjectivity, his lack of a sense of a reader, and his justification in God can all be read in relation to the Bakhtinian analysis. Rozanov describes an acute sense of separation and isolation from the world and his contemporary readers, which is the source of the 'subjectivity' that he later claims is his 'method':

Что бы я ни делал, кого бы ни видел - не могу ни с кем слиться. «Не совокупляющийся человек» - духовно. Человек - «solo».

Все это я выразил словом «иностранец», которое у меня прошепталося как величайшее осуждение себе, как величайшая грусть о себе, в себе.

Это - тоже рок.

[Ued. :90]

<...> странная черта моей психологии заключается в таком сильном ощущении пустоты около себя - пустоты, безмолвия и небытия вокруг и везде, - что я едва знаю, едва верю, едва допускаю, что мне «современничают» другие люди. Это кажется

невозможным и нелепым, но это - так.

[Ued.: 106]

Yet Rozanov's intense sense of 'subjectivity' frees him, he claims, from any accountability to others in his writing. It is a matter for himself and God:

Глубочайшая моя субъективность (пафос субъективности) сделала то, что я точно всю жизнь прожил за занавескою, не снимаемую, не раздираемую. «До этой занавески никто не смеет коснуться». Там я жил; там с собою, был правдив... А что говорил «по сю сторону занавески», - до правды этого, мне казалось, никому дела нет.<...>

Поэтому мне часто же казалось (и может быть, так это и есть), что я самый правдивый и искренний писатель: хотя тут не содержится ни скрупула нравственности.

«Так меня устроил Бог».

[Ued.: 98]

Умей искать уединения, умей искать уединения, умей искать уединения.

Уединение - лучший страж души. Я хочу сказать - ее Ангел Хранитель.

Из уединения - все. Из уединения - силы, из уединения - чистота.

Уединение - «собран дух», это - я опять «целен».

[Q. 1. I: 275-76]

This sense of spiritual isolation cannot find and does not seek outlet in the traditional forms of address to the reader. Rozanov claims that the only truth he can speak of is intensely subjective and private. The innate sense of isolation from others that Rozanov describes becomes his artistic freedom, a defence against the possible intrusion of another's judgement, obligation towards, or self-consciousness before, the other. He claims that he has no obligation to others because of a life-long loneliness and distance from them. Yet he also claims to draw a sense of spiritual strength and invincibility in God from his isolation. The reader is a remote witness to the process of self-uncovery that is undertaken before God. Yet solitary self-accounting, the first stage of this approach to God, is an address seemingly sufficient to itself, although it is dependent on a sense of God's surrounding presence:

Тут, в конце концов, та тайна (граничащая с безумием), что я сам с собой говорю: настолько постоянно, и внимательно, и страстно, что вообще, кроме этого, ничего не слышу. <...> В самом деле, дымящаяся головешка (часто в детстве вытаскивал из печи) - похожа на меня: ее совсем не видно, не видно щипцов, которыми ее держишь.

И Господь держит меня щипцами. «Господь надымил мною в мире».

[Q. 1. I: 251]



Writing is a spiritual self-exploration, based on the purity of a self-uncovery without external evaluation. It must be writing purely for oneself, an attempt to express in words for one's own understanding.<sup>54</sup> Rozanov's sense of the 'unreality' of a world of others, his claims of detachment, are an attempt to maintain this absolute purity of relationship to himself. Yet even this stance, which must be seen at least in part as a literary stance, for the books were published and sold, does not remain completely sufficient to the self. The dynamic of self-questioning is only sustained by some form of outward relationship. Writing may be for oneself but it maintains an awareness of the other, which for Rozanov was acute. While claiming solitude, Rozanov's writings bear witness to this inability to remain an eternal subject, sufficient only to oneself.

#### THE NEED FOR CONTINUAL UTTERANCE

For Bakhtin, utterance is a need as constant and continual as human growth, and this growth, or life of consciousness, is impossible without utterance. Like Bakhtin, Rozanov emphasized a continual process of verbal creation in man's freedom of utterance, according to the demands of his life: 'Молитвенное творчество, молитвенное созидание Церкви не кончено, не запечатано. О всякой скорби и во всякой муке можно молить Бога, и молить не общими, а особо приноровленными словами.'<sup>55</sup> In this way man's words to God are left undefined, a constant potential, according to the

needs of the moment. This form of spontaneous address is a guarantee of man's freedom from the constraints of dogmatic forms. Bakhtin emphasized the importance of a constant potential for new meaning, and new utterance as a source of new life:

Своею завершенностью и завершенностью события жить нельзя, нельзя поступать; чтобы жить, надо быть незавершенным, открытым для себя - во всяком случае, во всех существенных моментах жизни, - надо ценностно еще предстоять себе, не совпадать с своею наличностью.<sup>56</sup>

In particular, Bakhtin claimed that one's own self-accounting could never be a definitive, last word. The 'non-coincidence' of one's living self with the sum of utterances about oneself was the dynamic of life and speech:

<...> мое собственное слово о себе принципиально не может быть последним, завершающим меня словом; мое слово для меня самого есть мой поступок, а он жив только в едином и единственном событии бытия; а потому ни один поступок не может завершить собственной жизни, ибо он связывает жизнь с открытой бесконечностью события бытия. Самоотчет-исповедь не изолирует себя из этого единого события, отсюда он потенциально бесконечен. Самоотчет-исповедь есть именно акт принципиального и актуального несовпадения с самим собою <...>.<sup>57</sup>

The process of self-definition, as Bakhtin emphasizes, is a continual succession of unique utterances. No last word, or definition, can be made. Rozanov had recognized this as an important feature of Dostoevskii's work before Bakhtin. Contrasting Dostoevskii with Tolstoi, he writes:

<...> он аналитик неустановившегося в человеческой жизни и в человеческом духе.

<...> это есть анализ человеческой души вообще, в ее различных состояниях, стадиях, переходах, но не анализ индивидуальной, обособленной, и завершившейся внутренней жизни (как у графа Л. Н. Толстого).<sup>58</sup>

Rozanov's writing likewise sought to avoid a finalizing definition. This was a motivation for his repeated utterance and self-contradiction. Rozanov called his opavshie list'ia writings, 'my soul'.<sup>59</sup> He emphasized the continuous nature of his writing, in constant response to his own changing thoughts. He continued writing these 'leaves' until his death, as he wrote in the introduction to the second book of Opavshie list'ia, in 1913: 'Чем старее дерево, тем больше падает с него листьев.'<sup>60</sup> It is the irrepressible need to give words to feeling that fuels the constant process of writing that he claims constitutes his life:

С давнего времени мне эти «нечаянные восклицания» почему-то нравились. Собственно, они текут в нас

непрерывно, но их не успеваешь (нет бумаги под рукой) заносить, - и они умирают.

[Ued.: 36]

Я решительно не могу остановиться, удержаться, чтобы не говорить (писать) <...>

Эти говоры (шепоты) и есть моя «литература».

[Ued.: 124-25]

Segal argues that a sense of unhappiness and incompleteness perpetuated Rozanov's continual utterance which in turn renewed the sense of incompleteness.<sup>61</sup> He sees Rozanov's writing as an attempt at self-accounting and self-transformation through words.<sup>62</sup> This self-accounting is never finished. He claims that a deep sense of dissatisfaction and insufficiency fuels Rozanov's attempt, through writing, to assert himself, and to assert his connection to the surrounding world, while claiming to despise its judgement or approval. In Opavshie list'ia Rozanov's assertion of his solitude changes in tone from a confident to a more despairing defiance of his reader, to whom he appeals while rejecting him:

Левин верно упрекает меня в «эготизме». Конечно - это есть. И даже именно от этого я и писал (пишу) «Уед.»: писал (пишу) в глубокой тоске как-нибудь разорвать кольцо уединения. ...Это именно кольцо, надетое с рождения.

Из-за него я и кричу: вот что здесь, пусть - узнают,

если уже невозможно ни увидеть, ни осязать, ни прийти на помощь.

[Q. 1. I: 179]

Отсюда и «Уед.» как попытка выйти из-за ужасной «занавески», из-за которой не то чтобы я не хотел, но не мог выйти...

Это не физическая стена, а духовная, - о, как страшней физической.

[Q. 1. II: 337]

Writing is an escape from the suffocation of subjectivity, unhappiness and insufficiency. Writing is the only chance of breaking the burden of isolated observation, or at least of making that sense of isolation productive. Rozanov's incessant need for utterance is an attempt to understand and give life to the phenomenon of his own existence. He needs to write in order to make contact with the world. This writing acts not only as a self-renewal but as a renewal of the world and things that surround him. These are never threatened by a finalizing definition through his writing, the dead subsistence of 'givenness'. Rozanov goes out towards the world in words and so renews his life in the world by this catching of the momentary coincidence of time, external objects and his own thought. This is his task in writing, his zadanie, in Bakhtinian terms, a renewing process carried out on inert and given existence (dannost').<sup>63</sup>

Bakhtin maintained that this sense of a continual and unfinished process should be the organizational principle of one's life. He uses the term lichina, with its Orthodox religious resonance, to describe the false face that man's existence becomes if it fails to maintain this continual non-coincidence of self, this active and never satisfied response to the world:

Живое переживание во мне, в котором я активно активен, никогда не может успокоиться в себе, остановиться, кончиться, завершиться, не может выпасть из моей активности, застыть вдруг в самостоятельно законченное бытие <...>. Я не могу перестать быть активным в нем, это значило бы отменить себя в своем смысле, превратить себя только в личину своего бытия, в ложь самим собою себе самому. <...>.

<...> Мое единство для меня самого - вечно предстоящее единство; оно и дано и не дано мне, оно непрерывно завоевывается мною на острие моей активности <...>.<sup>64</sup>

A sense that the world and oneself are not given entities but recreated by acts of utterance is a predicate of existence:

Только сознание того, что в самом существенном меня еще нет, является организующим началом моей жизни из себя (в моем отношении к себе самому). Правое безумие принципиального несовпадения с самим собою данным

обуславливает форму моей изнутри-жизни.<...> Я живу в глубине себя вечной верой и надеждой на постоянную возможность внутреннего чуда нового рождения.<sup>65</sup>

Rozanov asserts precisely this 'miracle of new birth' as a description of his writerly invention. He speaks of his ideas as a constant new birth (novorozhdennost'), which is the source of the power of his writing. Rozanov continually defended the formlessness, the indefinability, that fuelled his writing. He recognized that accountability, in form, structure or any other way, to another who was not God could hinder the process of self-expression. He claimed to be as wary of the reader's praise as of his condemnation. As Bakhtin maintained, the approach of the other could penetrate and cloud the purity of the axiological relationship to oneself:

По отношению к этим трансгредиентным моментам, то есть возможному ценностному сознанию другого, самочет-исповедь устанавливается отрицательно, борется с ними за чистоту самосознания, чистоту одинокого отношения к себе самому. Ибо эстетический подход и оправдание другого могут проникнуть в мое ценностное отношение к себе самому и замутнить его чистоту (слава людская, мнение людей, стыд людей, милость людей и проч.).<sup>66</sup>

For Rozanov, the bid at Bakhtinian non-coincidence was made primarily through his writing, which increasingly became

the grounds of his existence. Even Rozanov's protests against the literary existence, his defence of the immediate experience of life, were transcribed and became literature.

### SELF-CONDEMNATION

Bakhtin describes the ways in which self-accounting maintains a rigour and purity in relation to itself against possible evaluations by real or imagined others. Eventually, self-accounting and solitary reflection find an outlet in appeal to an ultimate other, which could be God. However, there is a precarious transitional stage between rejection of the one's contemporary interlocutors, and acceptance of God. At this stage it is hardest of all to maintain the purity of one's relationship to self. Self-condemnation is a stage in the process of self-accounting, a deflection of others' outward evaluation when one has not yet the confidence of refuge in God: 'всякое успокоение, остановка в своем самоосуждении, всякая положительная оценка <...> воспринимаются как отпадение от чистоты самоотношения, как одержание возможным оценивающим другим'.<sup>67</sup> Self-condemnation is thus a process by which the protagonist hopes to get to the truth of himself. Bakhtin argues that this constant self-criticism prevents the individual from falling prey to vanity, a false self-evaluation that stalls the process of self-uncovery. Self-condemnation is a bid to preserve the continuity of the



process of self-uncovery, to fend off a possible completing evaluation by another's judgement. Bakhtin discusses Dostoevskii's heroes as examples of this assertive self-accounting and self-condemnation before the other, as an evasion, anticipation or subversion of their possible response.<sup>68</sup> Rozanov describes his own life and literary attempts in terms that express a dynamic of self-engagement on a par with Dostoevskii's protagonists: 'фуга самоуединения, самоожесточения, самопрезрения и вражды, вражды, вражды... с просветами умилений, слез прощения. Всего было.'<sup>69</sup>

Like Bakhtin, Rozanov is also preoccupied with the pitfalls of writerly vanity. It is the imagined, as much as the actual reader, that he needs to distance himself from. The anticipation of oneself in the eyes of another threatens to cloud the purity of self-perception since one is in danger of adopting a falsifying pose. Rozanov and Bakhtin both use the idea of a mirror reflection to emphasize the dangers of imagined self-knowledge. The image that we receive is always deceptive since it is shaped by the distorting viewpoint of an imagined other, for whom we strike a pose:

В самом деле, наше положение перед зеркалом всегда несколько фальшиво <...>.<sup>70</sup>

Философские и этические различия между внутренним самосозерцанием (я-для-себя) и созерцанием себя в зеркале

(я-для-другого, с точки зрения другого).<sup>71</sup>

Rozanov wrote of the danger of 'looking in the mirror' when writing:

Боже, сохрани во мне это писательское целомудрие: не смотреться в зеркало.

Писатели значительные от ничтожных почти только этим отличаются: смотрятся в зеркало - не смотрятся в зеркало.

[Q. 1. I: 229]

The knowledge that we get from a mirror is a distorted view of the self, just as the writers who 'look in the mirror' cloud their sense of the truth, particularly if they are seeking a flattering reflection. Rozanov seeks a writing that is free of an evaluative audience, real or imagined, and thus free from the falsifying temptations of writerly vanity: 'Ни одно читательское лицо мне не воображалось, ни один оценивающий ум не вырисовывался. И я всегда писал один, в сущности - для себя.' [Q. 1. I: 249]

#### GUILT AND REPENTANCE

Rozanov's writing is marked by frequent self-condemnation, as well as hyperbolic self-exultation. He claims to be marked, like the hero of Zapiski iz podpol'ia, by a strong awareness of his own guilt, which he links to his

subjectivity, sense of separation and distance from the world. His assertion of his guilt, his self-condemnation and repentance has a specific aim, to lead him out of the precarious phase of solitary self-accounting towards a prayerful redemption in God. He describes his sinfulness as a source of his isolation:

Страшное одиночество за всю жизнь. С детства. Одинокие души суть затаенные души. А затаенность - от порочности. Страшная тяжесть одиночества. Не от этого ли боль?

Не только от этого.

[Ued.: 120]

Yet this guilt, or sin, is also a source of relation to the world:

Что же была та стрела, которую постоянно чувствовал в моем сердце? И от которой, в сущности, и происходит вся моя литература.

Это - грех мой.

Через грех я познавал все в мире и через грех (раскаяние) относился ко всему в мире.

[Ued.: 103]

Sin and repentance bring Rozanov out of his isolation and detachment and allow him to penetrate, and thus participate

in, the world of things. Bakhtin saw the transition from sin into repentance, the verbal avowal and appeal against one's sinfulness, as the point at which the subject throws himself outwards, to the other and towards the mercy of God. Only in the repentance that leads to God can the individual find an organizing principle for his self-expression that leads him away from the circular and disintegrating limitations of himself. Bakhtin argued that this was because in repentance the speaker or author maintains the energy of speech as deed and potential (zadannost').<sup>72</sup> He maintains a sense of himself as an uncompleted potential. No finalizing evaluation, or utterance, has been made:

Над своею наличностью я могу замедлить только в покаянных тонах, ибо это промедление совершается в свете заданности. Но как только я выпускаю из ценностного поля своего видения свою заданность и перестаю напряженно быть с собою в будущем, моя данность теряет свое предстоящее единство для меня, распадается, расслаивается в тупо-наличные фрагменты бытия.<sup>73</sup>

Repentance is a guarantee of the unfinishedness and lack of definition that was the constant dynamic of Rozanov's writing. This is an utterly Bakhtinian principle of creative utterance. Sin and repentance is seen as the only way to bridge the gulf between oneself and the world, to force out the word that is redemption.<sup>74</sup> In this way

Rozanov escapes his isolation and addresses the world, and eventually the other of God, who is the guarantee of his writing. Yet Rozanov recognized the difficulty in finding a sense of God:

Чувство Бога есть самое трансцендентное в человеке, наиболее от него далекое, труднее всего достигаемое: только самые богатые, мощные души и лишь через испытания, горести, страдания, и более всего через грех, <...> достигают этих высот <...>. <sup>75</sup>

Rozanov claimed that he needed to break free from his powerful isolation and self-absorption. The process of self-condemnation is a search for release, through repentance for sin, in which Rozanov can again perceive himself innocent in the hands of God. In Apokalipsis nashego vremeni, Rozanov wrote that mankind inherited this sense of sin, and release from sin in prayer and invocation of God, from the Jews:

И везде они несут благородную и святую идею «греха» (я плачу), без которой нет религии, а человечество было бы разбито (праведным небом), если бы «от жидов» не научилось трепетать и молить о себе за грех.

[Апок.: 614]

The Jews gave prayers and psalms through which man could find release from self-contained sin. Bakhtin also

describes this transition from self-condemnation and repentance to tones of faith and hope in the Psalm of David (Psalm 50).<sup>76</sup> In Opavshie list'ia, Rozanov wrote of the power of the sigh (vzdokh) that inspired the psalms, against the seeming self-sufficient organization of contemporary society.<sup>77</sup>

<...> пусть мы оба в вони, в грязи, в грехе, в смраде.

Но у нас есть вздох.

<...>

Все это лежит во «вздохе»... В «дуновении», «душе». «Корректные люди» суть просто «неодушевленные существа» - «линейка» и «транспарант», <...>

Но в моем «вздохе» все лежит. «Вздох» богаче царства, богаче Ротшильда даже деньгами: из «вздоха» потекут золотые реки, и трон, и царство, и все.

Вздох - всемирная история, начало ее. А «корректный человек» есть корректный человек, которым все кончится, и сам он уже есть Смерть и Гроб.

<...>

К «вздоху» Бог придет: но скажите, пожалуйста, неужели Бог придет к корректному человеку?

[O. I. II: 567-68]

Rozanov showed Dostoevskii's influence in his conviction that the most sacred was to be found in places that society labels as most sinful, and that even the worst depths of degradation can lead one to redemption:

Да, в «грехе» и «смраде» мир силен и как-то прав.<sup>78</sup>

- Мои ошибки так же священны - как и мои правды, п. ч. они текут из действительности, а действительность священна.<sup>79</sup>

Необыкновенно любопытны опыты смешения, смешивания грешного и святого. Что кого победит? которое выживет? что сильнее? Чрезвычайно любопытно. Само христианство есть, до известной степени, опыт такого смешения: Бог сошел на Землю - святейшее среди грешного. Нельзя отрицать, что это - так.<sup>80</sup>

However, Rozanov also accused the Christian Church of burdening mankind with an illusion of sinfulness that was itself a sin. Sin is valuable only when it is liberating and leads to God:

Мы полощемся, обмываемся, сцарапываем с себя грех: когда единственный наш грех после Спасителя и состоит в гипотезе, что мы еще грешны, все-таки не святы.<sup>81</sup>

<...> психика угнетенности наконец переходит и в психику озлобления: так тяжело, что я становлюсь и в самом деле дурен, я ищу и подлинно нахожу (создаю) вину! Т. е. иллюзия греха создает в самом деле грех.<sup>82</sup>

Некоторый % зла, ну даже низкого, неблагородного, лежит и после грехопадения, не может не лежать в каждом человеке:

примем это «как судьбу», как свою долю, и друг у друга не будем придирааться к этому и «корить человека за неvyдержанность идеала».

Бог с ними, с идеалами <...>. Возьмем живую натурку «как есть» и лучше будем отыскивать в ней, не завалилось ли в уголке чего-нибудь хорошего.<sup>83</sup>

Man is sacred for Rozanov, in his weakness, confusion and sin. Any attained ideal is for Rozanov a completion, and thus a sort of death. Yet despite the sense of an illusory aspect of sin, Rozanov's writing is strongly marked by the late and 'fallen' civilization in which he was living. Guilt is an important feature of his writing: the guilt of living without writing or giving utterance, and simultaneously the guilt of writing and not living; the guilt of extreme self-consciousness from which he was unable to free himself. One could see the incessant need to write as a sort of self-confession, but Rozanov insists that this is not confession.<sup>84</sup>

Совершенно не заметили, что есть нового в «У.». Сравнили с «Испов.» Р., тогда как я прежде всего не исповедуюсь.

[О. 1. I: 249]

A public and literary confession, like that of Rousseau, would mean a compliance with literariness and the traditional forms of address to the reader with which



Rozanov claims to be breaking. Least of all does he want to be seen to need the reader's approval, which a confession might imply. Rozanov claims that his writing is for himself and, more remotely, for God. It rejects the sanction or consolation of the immediate reader. Bakhtin focuses on the transition from self-condemnation to penitence and beseeching prayer. God becomes the authority and last resort. God allows man to continue the process of questioning beyond the limitations of his own existence. The appeal to God is a potential for new utterance, it is the dynamic of this utterance:

Чистый самоотчет, то есть ценностное обращение только к себе самому в абсолютном одиночестве, невозможен; это предел, уравниваемый другим пределом - исповедью, то есть просительной обращенностью вовне себя, к богу. С покаянными тонами сплетаются тона просительно-молитвенные.<sup>85</sup>

#### PAIN AND SUFFERING

Rozanov's declarations of his own weakness, sinfulness, and also pain (bol') are dear to him as they are a move out of himself, out of self-sufficiency, towards a possibly redeeming other. Guilt, self-condemnation, a sense of sin, tears, extreme pain, fear, or an unbearable solitude can force out the word that is a possible redemption, and are moments in the transition, through penitence and petition,

towards prayer. Rozanov writes of prayer as the point at which one's insufficiency to oneself becomes unbearable: 'Сущность молитвы заключается в признании глубокого своего бессилия, глубокой ограниченности. Молитва - где «я не могу»; где «я могу» - нет молитвы.' [O. 1. I: 166]

Rozanov repeatedly linked prayer and religion with a sense of pain:

БЫТЬ С МОЛИТВОЙ И БОЛЬЮ.

Это и есть последняя правда моей жизни. После которой, естественно, все прежнее я называл «ложью».

[Smert.: 159]

Болят душа, болят душа, болят душа...

И что делать с этой болью - я не знаю.

Но только при боли я и согласен жить... Это есть самое дорогое мне и во мне.

[Ued.: 117]

In Opavshie list'ia, Rozanov expressed gratitude for those who had written about him, but complained that they had missed the point. Chukovskii was the only writer who came close, he said, but even he had not fathomed the essential source of Rozanov's writing.<sup>86</sup> This was the pain that he also recognized as a motive and source for his writing:

<...> он не угадал моего интимного. Это - боль; какая-то

беспредметная, беспричинная и почти непрерывная. Мне кажется - это самое поразительное, по крайней мере - необъяснимое. Мне кажется, с болью я родился <...>.

<...> Боль моя всегда относится к чему-то одинокому, и чему-то больному, и чему-то далекому; точнее: что я - одинок, и оттого, что не со мной какая-то даль, и что эта даль как-то болит, - или я болю, что она только даль... Тут есть «порыв», «невозможность» и что я сам и все «не то, не то»...

[Q. 1. II: 478-79]

Psychological pain, like sin, is a form of relationship with the world, a way of breaking one's isolation if only momentarily. The mood itself is a release, leading to the tones of repentance and prayer.<sup>97</sup> Rozanov describes it as a touchstone of values, 'the ultimate truth of my life'. Pain revivifies the sense of the living connections between things which Rozanov claimed he often felt unable to believe in; this was the root of his defence of pain and prayer. Pain forced out prayer that was the expression of a reawakened sense of connection to things in words, with a heightened emotional pitch which he described as his 'burning' pain. Pain is proof of man's spiritual need: 'Боль жизни гораздо могущественнее интереса к жизни. Вот отчего религия всегда будет одолевать философию.' [Ued.,: 46] Rozanov emphasizes this source of prayer and religion in a prayer-like incantation from Opavshie list'ia:

Тихие темные ночи...

Испуг преступления...

Тоска одиночества...

Слезы отчаянья, страха и пота труда.

Вот ты, религия...

Помощь согбенному...

Помощь усталому...

Вера больного...

Вот твои корни, религия...

Вечные, чудные корни...

[Ued.: 116-17]

Rozanov was so immersed in the pain that he felt to be a central fact of human existence that the emotion at times took over from the approach to God. Man's religious needs are emphasized to the point where it seems that it is man's pain that has created religion, and the sense of God. God becomes a product of pain. Man's need for religion is dearer to Rozanov than religion for its own sake. Rozanov wonders if God can share in man's weakness, if he too feels pain:<sup>88</sup>

Болят ли Б. о нас? Есть ли у Б. боль по человеку? Есть ли у Б. вообще боль: как по «свойствам бытия Б-жия» (по схоластике).

[Q. 1. I: 330]

Rozanov claimed that man had an instinct for

suffering. Like Dostoevskii, Rozanov saw suffering as a possible source of knowledge, truth and purification. He claims that man is drawn irresistably towards suffering, as the source of the most profound questions that he can ask.<sup>89</sup> Rozanov made man's need for suffering the central focus of his analysis in his Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore. He claimed that suffering was more powerful than happiness, and wrote that loving a man in his joy was a far greater task than loving him in his sadness.

В этой жажде бытия и в неутолимой же жажде стать достойным его хотя бы через страдание опять угадана Достоевским глубочайшая черта истории, самая существенная, быть может центральная.<sup>90</sup>

<...> правы все, которые думают, что страдание очищает, просветляет и смягчает душу человека.<sup>91</sup>

Унижение всегда переходит через несколько дней в такое душевное сияние, с которым не сравнится ничто. Не невозможно сказать, что некоторые, и притом высочайшие просветления недостижимы без предварительной униженности <...>.

Не на этой ли тайне всемирной психологичности <...> основано то, что наконец, «Он захотел пострадать?...».

[Ued.: 81]

Suffering also becomes, for Rozanov, a way of

justifying writing, since it brings this writing closer to prayer. He saw the impulse to 'write down', to give utterance to one's suffering, as a form of redemption. Rozanov writes about Turgenev's suffering as a motivation for writing: 'Важен инстинкт написания, возведение страдания в культ, к святости («мощи»), к религии.'<sup>92</sup> This 'instinct for writing down' was what Rozanov observed in himself, stemming from an emotional need that took the form of appeal to God and to unknown and unseen readers. Suffering finds release in writing. For Rozanov it was also in part a justification of his writing in which he otherwise sensed a deep moral ambiguity. Rozanov argues that writing is an essential part of the transmission of suffering from the physical, temporal boundaries in which it is contained so that it can participate in something much greater, more eternal:

Не страдай так ужасно Иов, можно ли было написать «Книгу Иова»?.. «Книга Иова», вот эти тридцать страничек, которые читаются в течение тридцати веков... Но, Боже, стоит минуту подумать, чтобы понять, что «Книга Иова» есть сама по себе факт, сама по себе история, действительность, и притом такая, в которой материи и содержательности, крови, нервов и жизни более, чем в каком бы то ни было Иове, жил он или нет, страдал или не страдал. <...> все конкретное, - увы! - краткотечно и как-то остается «без последствий»... В «Книге Иова» гораздо больше жизни, души, силы, действительности, нежели было всего этого в самом Иове, а

между тем, не страдай Иов, не появилось бы и «Книги Иова».<sup>93</sup>

Rozanov here identifies a function of writing that becomes a recurrent feature of his work. Writing can give voice to an individual, specific suffering, and make it into an immense and universally powerful phenomenon. Averintsev has noted the importance of suffering in the Near Eastern verbal tradition. He describes the situatedness of suffering in the Old Testament, in the living experience, conveyed in words, so that the reader participates directly in the emotion. He contrasts this with the artificial distancing of the more 'literary' Hellenic tradition. Averintsev sees both traditions as formative of Russian verbal creation. However, he makes clear certain fundamental divergences between the approach to the word in each culture. At times he thus comes close to betraying his own sympathies:

<...> страдание дано здесь не как жизненная ситуация страдания, составляющая, скажем, тему «Книги Иова» или многих псалмов, не как стихия боли, захватывающая и читателя, но как зрелище, как объектный предмет наблюдения, «характер» и «маска» страдальца. С точки зрения ближневосточной поэтики такой подход приходится оценить, пожалуй, как недозволенное «баловство», как злоупотребление инструментом слова.<sup>94</sup>

Rozanov's emphasis in his writing on the situatedness and living experience of the moment of emotion, and his demand that his readers participate directly in the emotional experience of his writing places him closer to the Near Eastern and Biblical traditions, towards which he was far more sympathetic. Rozanov's complaint against literature is against the artifice, distancing and invention that Averintsev describes as developed in the Hellenic tradition. Averintsev contrasts this with the sense of immediate access to God, of the right to cry to God from the depths of one's own suffering that is the essential life of the Old Testament tradition: 'Ветхий завет - это книга, в которой никто не стыдится страдать и кричать о своей боли.'<sup>95</sup>

Rozanov constantly insists on the centrality of pain (bol') to his writing. He makes frequent reference to the Old Testament and explicitly compared himself to the prophets. He describes his writing as a cry. He insists that his writing is not literature in the sense of invention but comes from the situation of his life and his needs. Rozanov wants in many ways to 'overcome literature', to get back to a time where words were a spontaneous expression of feeling, in prayers and song and psalms, which he calls the 'birth of literature', before the emergence of literature as artifice. Averintsev describes the divergence of the Near Eastern and Hellenic verbal traditions similarly, distinguishing between spontaneous verbal creation and self-conscious literary art:



В Греции произошло то, чего <...> принципиально не могло и не должно было произойти в ближневосточном мире: литература впервые осознала себя именно литературой, то есть самозаконной формой человеческой деятельности, явно для себя противостоящей всему, что не есть она сама, - например, стихийному экстатическому «вещанию» пророков, а также культу, обряду, быту и вообще «жизни».<sup>96</sup>

Rozanov's writing was aimed at a restoration of this pre-literary, prophetic sense of life to the word. He wanted to release an 'elemental' energy and spontaneity in the written word. He sought to return Russian literature, which had developed by the end of the nineteenth century into an immensely powerful self-sufficient entity and authority, to what he saw as its true and sacred source, rooted in life itself, in the spontaneous declarations of the prophets, and the words that emerge from a sacred sense of everyday life. This is the tradition that Averintsev designates Near Eastern slovesnost' in contrast to Greek literatura, it is a tradition which encompasses the more religious and less literary forms of verbal creation, such as prayer and prophecy.

PRAYER

The Near Eastern verbal tradition that Averintsev describes is founded on a view of the word as thoroughly immediate to life and responsive to the needs of the moment. It is a word that will not be frozen in the moment of transcription, but is unique to each moment of utterance. As outlined at the beginning, this view of the word is central to the Russian religious and philosophical tradition and is resonant in the thought and writing of both Rozanov and Bakhtin. Rozanov's need to fix the moment in words is a constant dynamic of his work. This spontaneous utterance of emotions is very close to the Old Testament spirit of prayer and cries to God. Only when the word is as intimate to living experience as in prayer does Rozanov find justification in writing. A world without literature is possible, desirable even, but a world without any form of solitary utterance, without prayer, would be impossible:

Выньте, так сказать, из самого существа мира молитву - сделайте, чтобы язык мой, ум мой разучился словам ее, самому делу ее, существу ее; чтобы я этого не мог, люди этого не могли: и я с выпученными глазами и ужасным воем выбежал бы из дому, и бежал, бежал, пока не упал. Без молитвы совершенно нельзя жить... Без молитвы - безумие и ужас.

Rozanov insists on the necessity for prayer in contemporary life. Prayer is the source of life and growth in Russian cultural and religious life. For Rozanov it is more essential than ritual, as it contains a continual creative potential: 'Душа Православия - в даре молитвы. Тело его - обряды, культ. Но кто подумал бы, что, кроме обрядов в нем нет ничего <...> - тот все-таки при всяческом уме не понял бы в нем ничего.' [Ued.: 108]

Rozanov emphasizes the empowering force of prayer, it is open to any man, at any time. Any man may speak, and God wants him to speak. As shown above, Bakhtin emphasized the impossibility of an exclusively self-referential consciousness, without an outlet in God as absolute other. In Rozanov's view, God's willingness for man to speak can lead to man's justification of his words through God's will, against the words of those who have set themselves up as the guardians of the word that binds or commands in religious and political life. Man's speech in God, as prayer, confession or prophecy, is thus a source of resistance to hierarchy, whether this hierarchy is in government, religion or literature. In a passage in Uedinennoe, Rozanov describes the warmth of Orthodox priests towards him, despite his battles with the Church, and claims that the Church is the last refuge of warmth on earth. Having chosen the Church, he describes prayer as a joyful freedom in God, associating it with play, dances and feasting. With prayer, 'everything is permitted':

<...> Религиозный человек выше мудрого, выше поэта, выше победителя и оратора. «Кто молится» победит всех, <...>

<...> Лучше суеверие, лучше глупое, лучше черное, но с молитвой. Религия, или - ничего. <...>

Мой выбор решен.

Молитва - и игра.

Молитва - и пиры.

Молитва - и танцы.

Но в сердцевине всего - молитва.

Есть «молящий человек» - и можно все.

Нет «его» - и ничего нельзя.

Это мое «credo», - и я сойду с ним в гроб.

Я начну великий танец молитвы. С длинными трубами, с музыкой, со всем: и все будет дозволено, потому что все будет замолено. <...>

«С нами Бог» - это вечно.

[Ued.:122-23]

The freedom that an individual has in his private and intimate words to God allows for a spontaneous personal approach to God, even when this speech takes place among others. This is an important part of Orthodox religion. Prayer allows for the freedom of a highly individual approach to God, while recognizing one's connection to the whole. Man is seen as being free to make his creative

utterance on which there is no evaluative constraint. God is a guarantee of this freedom. It is within this tradition that Rozanov turns away from the imposing and threatening values of his contemporaries, towards God, as a guarantor of inner spiritual freedom and self-exploration. Rozanov recognized this release by his linking of prayer with communal celebration, in feasts and dancing. Rozanov's sense of freedom in God releases him from temporal and textual authorities:

Миллион лет прошло, пока моя душа выпущена была погулять на белый свет; и вдруг бы я ей сказал: «Ты, душенька, не забывайся и гуляй «по морали».

Нет я ей скажу: «Гуляй, душенька, гуляй, славненькая, гуляй, добренькая, гуляй как сама знаешь. А к вечеру пойдешь к Богу».

Ибо жизнь моя есть день моя, и он именно мой день, а не Сократа или Спинозы.

[Ued.: 86]

Sukach argues that the peculiarities of Rozanov's style, the sense of inspiration and self-sufficiency, come from the source of his writing which was this very intimate, individual conversation with God.<sup>97</sup> Rozanov repeatedly maintained his sense of God as the ultimate author of his utterance in his opavshie list'ia genre. God is the ultimate guarantor of all the self-contradictions, outspokenness and intimacy of Rozanov's words. Rozanov

repeatedly insists on God's closeness and watchful protection:

Бог мой! вечность моя! Отчего же душа моя так прыгает, когда я думаю о Тебе...

И все держит рука Твоя: что она меня держит - это я постоянно чувствую.

[Ued.: 77]

Averintsev's description of man's sense of God in the Near Eastern verbal tradition is close to Rozanov's own address to God through his writing. This God is described as an immediate physical presence, alien to theory or intellectual category:

Человек в ближневосточной словесности никогда не остается по-настоящему один, ибо даже тогда, когда рядом с ним нет людей, его утешающий или грозящий бог всегда рядом, и его присутствие дано как нечто до крайности насущное, конкретное, осязаемое, так что места для холодной интеллектуальной отстраненности от всего сущего просто не остается.<sup>98</sup>

Rozanov, like Averintsev, emphasizes the concrete presence of God, a presence that can be sensed. God is a real entity with whom man is constantly in dialogue. He is not remote, but someone whose moods and response can be anticipated, like human responses. Rozanov's addresses to God use the

familiar human tone that suggest an immediate, and intimate, interlocutor. As Averintsev notes, the sense of the closeness of God, even in solitude, becomes a principle and motivation of utterance: 'В ближневосточных преданиях никто не стесняется нуждаться в другом; человек жаждет и алчет преданности другого человека <...> и милости бога.'<sup>99</sup>

Rozanov's appeal to God is an appeal for release from an impossible and unbearable solitude. He explores his sense of solitude and resulting relationship with God in Uedinennoe. He eschews all intellectual definitions of God and equates his sense of God with the movement of his emotional life, the pitches of mood that stimulate utterance. He even asks whether God is not the same as his mood. Indeed Rozanov's sense of God is barely extricable from his own subjectivity, and yet it is a way of transcending the limitations of this subjectivity by positing an other towards which his emotional confusions and fear of finality can have relation and acquire shape.

<...> когда я один - я полный, а когда со всеми - не полный. Одному мне все-таки лучше.

\*\*\*

Одному лучше - потому что, когда один, - я с Богом.

\*\*\*

Я мог бы отказаться от даров, от литературы, от будущности своего я, от славы или известности, слишком мог бы; <...>. Но от Бога я никогда не мог бы отказаться. Бог есть самое «теплое» для меня. С Богом мне «всего теплее».

С Богом никогда не скучно и не холодно.

В конце концов Бог - моя жизнь.

Я только живу для Него, через Него. Вне Бога - меня нет.

<...>

Так что же Он такое для меня?

Моя вечная грусть и радость. Особенная, ни к чему не относящаяся?

Так не есть ли Бог «мое настроение»?

Я люблю того, кто заставляет меня грустить и радоваться, кто со мной говорит; меня упрекает, меня утешает.

Это Кто-то. Это - Лицо. Бог для меня всегда «он». Или «ты»; - всегда близок.

Мой Бог - особенный. Это только мой Бог; и еще ничей. Если еще «чей-нибудь» - то этого я не знаю и не интересуюсь.

«Мой Бог» - бесконечная моя интимность, бесконечная моя индивидуальность.

[Ued.: 75-76]

God is not given an objective commanding authority, but is almost the creation of Rozanov. Rozanov calls God 'My God', and addresses him with the familiar 'ty'. God is for



Rozanov a part of, and justification of, the intimacy and subjectivity that is his writing 'method'. God is the organizational principle of Rozanov's life and writing, but he is a God as intimate as his own subjective self. Only through God, posited as a potential eternity, a source of eternal value, can Rozanov sustain his sense of subjective utterance. Thus passing words can be transcribed and sent 'into eternity'. In this way, Rozanov speaks of his writing, that 'God wills', as a way of making sacred and eternal the hidden and transitory moments of life. Rozanov's sense of God as a part of his individual subjective life is a guarantee against the loss, that he felt to be so imminent, of these transitory feelings and words. God is a constant focus amidst Rozanov's sense of a chaotic and fragmented existence. He claims that he is lost when he loses his sense of God: 'Боже, Боже, зачем Ты забыл меня? Разве Ты не знаешь, что всякий раз, как Ты забываешь меня, я теряюсь.' [Ued.: 85]

Rozanov asserts the divine origin of his writing both as a protection of his subjectivity and as an authority for an intimate freedom that has its source in the Orthodox tradition of prayer. The assertion of a religious state allows for an intimate dialogue with God that preserves Rozanov's almost dream-like state of subjectivity and avoids too great an accountability to the reader. It is a way of resolving the problem of the intrusiveness of the imagined reader's reaction, the reader's possible infringement on Rozanov's freedom of utterance and

continual process of self-exploration. Rozanov emphasizes his intimate communication with God in speech or 'whispers', although it is ironic that the reader has access to this through printed writing that betrays the exclusiveness of this communication.

God is a guarantee of Rozanov's freedom. Thus Rozanov finds authority in God for the boldness of his claims, his intimacy, freedom of speech, and his independence from the reader. Rozanov's adoption of God as a part of his own 'subjectivity' might seem to undermine the authority of God's own word. Yet Rozanov is also persistent in his reminders of our need for God's word. He describes his own first realization of this need, which arose, significantly, in contrast to a period of immersion in Ancient Greek literature, thus in a similar juxtaposition to that made by Averintsev in the descriptions quoted above:

И тут я почувствовал, именно сейчас после смены тех греческих впечатлений, до чего же это могущественнее, проще, нужнее, святее всего, всего... Первый раз я понял, почему это «боговдохновенно», т.е. почему так решили люди вот об этой единственной книге, а не о других. Это шло куда-то в бездонную глубину души... Это было совсем другое, чем Демосфен. О чудная Сирия, о твои тайны! Ничего мы не понимаем в Востоке. Бог говорит, а то - человек говорит. Да не важно, что тут (у Исайи) «Бог» написано. И мы везде и всюду это «Бог» пишем. Но если бы «Бог» и не было написано (у Исайи): все равно я и всякий почувствовали бы, что это -

Божие слово, что вообще это какое-то нечеловеческое слово. И как оно нужно! И как оно дорого! Оно спасительно, опять не в нравоучительном смысле, а в каком-то другом, глубочайшем - вот в чем дело.<sup>100</sup>

The failing of the contemporary age, as Rozanov sees it, is that people are no longer receptive to the word in this sense. People's sense of words has become too analytical, and words are used too abundantly for their living force to be felt. Bereft of words as events (slovo-sobytie), the active creative impulses in life have been replaced by a shadowy literarization of life. Rozanov believed that the loss of this sense of divine language was one of the foremost evils of contemporary civilization. When man's sense of God's word is replaced by confidence solely in his own words, language begins to degenerate. Rozanov sees the decline of prayer as responsible for much of the banality and characterlessness of contemporary life and thought. He described the weakness of contemporary writing as rooted in man's loss of a sense of language as prayer: 'Он все более и более разучается молиться: молитва есть обращение души к Богу, а между тем, его душа обращается только к себе.'<sup>101</sup> Man no longer has a sense of the spiritual potential of his own language. He no longer sees it as a connection to something beyond the empirical boundaries of his world. He has become so insensitive to the power of language that he would not even react to the words of a modern day prophet:

Особенность века, почти главная особенность, самая мучительная, самая скорбная, самая опасная, заключается в том, что если бы <...> появился восставший из гроба апостол Павел, со всем огнем своего слова и убедительностью мысли, то, конечно, «ученики Бокля и Чернышевского» на него бы даже не оглянулись.<sup>102</sup>

### PROPHECY

Rozanov repeatedly appeals to the 'spirit of prophecy' that he feels has been lost by modern civilization. Prophecy, for Rozanov, is a true recognition of the intrinsic power of the word. It is the only way to counteract the deadening 'nominalism', the loss of spirit in words that pervades contemporary literature, journalism, daily life and even religious worship. Prophecy has a central role in Rozanov's writing.<sup>103</sup> Prophecy is a reinstatement of the word in its original religious sense, as an active deed, a word made flesh, or fact. He calls it a 'word-event' (slovo-sobytie) as he describes the Book of Revelation: 'И, хоть это странно спрашивать о таких событиях-словах: нет ли чего показующего для души в стиле литературного изложения?' [Апок.: 589] Rozanov's use of this term anticipates Bakhtin's far more broad adoption of it to describe the word as event and deed. Prophecy emphasizes the spoken not written utterance, its action is in the immediate context. Rozanov believed that Christian culture had lost this sense of the word. In the article 'Istinnyi "fin de siècle"', he

writes of the need for a creative storm to inspire man with the Old Testament sense of the word:

Дайте нам еще арфу, опять Давида <...>. Таким образом, «fin de siècle», тоска Гоголя, предчувствие Достоевского, да и глубокая полутревога, полуотвращение всех нас имеет фундаментом под собою то общее явление, что недостает творческой и неиссякаемой, вечно неиссякаемой бури, которую в наших бедных сердцах подняло бы «слово живота».<sup>104</sup>

Averintsev describes the importance of prophecy to the Russian religious tradition of the word. He writes of it as an active and creative principle immediate to the moment of utterance and not seeking a merely textual immortality. His description is very much in the spirit of Bakhtin, emphasizing the importance of the word as event (slovo-sobytie) and the unliterary, unauthorial word (ne-avtorskoe slovo), thrown into the immediate situation of constant dialogue:

На Ближнем Востоке каждое слово предания говорится всякий раз внутри непосредственно жизненного общения говорящего со своим богом и с себе подобными: так, пророк отнюдь не имеет претензий «создать» некий шедевр на века, <...> но зато желает быть по-человечески услышанным, и притом незамедлительно. Потому это слово - принципиально не-авторское слово, брошенное на волю потока, предоставленное всем превратностям непрекращающегося

разговора.<sup>105</sup>

Averintsev refers to the Old Testament tradition of verbal creation, which Rozanov was most drawn to. Controversially, Rozanov linked the loss of a sacred sense of the word with New Testament Christianity, which he claimed had encouraged dogma and nominalism in religious life. Rozanov argued that prophecy would once again be possible if only man could free himself from the deadening authorities of written texts: 'в самом деле христианству недостает и даже собственно всегда недоставало пророков; и не было в нем самого духа пророческого'.<sup>106</sup> In Temnyi lik Rozanov argues that this lack of a spirit of prophecy is not the fault of Christ himself, but of popular interpretations of Christianity. He seeks to overcome this lack by emphasizing that Christ must not be separated from the original prophesying God of the Old Testament:

Отделяют Бога от Христа, когда этого нельзя. Здесь один субъект, глаголящий и творящий, и пророчество Христово уже влечет события, как нога идущего тащит башмак. Не было бы пророчества - не будет факта; а стало быть, если было пророчество, то факт непременно будет, сбудется, и - не станем же впадать в антропоморфизм - он сбудется вследствие пророчества. «Будет» в устах Божиих равно «да будет».<sup>107</sup>

Rozanov recognized that the original prophetic word had the power to become facts: 'Глаголы Божии суть события

истории.'<sup>108</sup> Prophecy relates to the actual, not merely the intellectual world. It is a forcing of the word out into the living lives of men, for this reason it had particular power for Rozanov. Rozanov characteristically centres the origin of prophecy, as of religion, in man's need, not God's command. In an attack on the Church's formalization of religious structures as an obstacle to religious feeling, he speaks of man's instinctive prophetic nature:

Человек метафизичен по самому существу своему: и если он воспринимает религии, усваивает одну или другую, слушает проповедников, то потому именно, что он раньше услышанной проповеди есть уже исповедник, священник до оформленного священства и пророк до оформившегося пророчества.<sup>109</sup>

Rozanov believed that the failure of organized religion to respond to the needs of the moment was symptomatic of a more widespread loss, a failure in the life of the word, which should be a fiery, energizing force: 'Слово есть бич духовный так-же, как и питающая манна <...> будем бояться глухоты сердца при гремящих «словах любви». Будем правдивы, будем грубы, будем просты...' [Lit. izq.: 497]

Rozanov claimed that his writing was a form of literary prophecy which would awaken man's sense of a living word. He sought to create what he saw as an intimate and domestic prophecy, which would return people to the living facts of their lives. He saw man's attention, in words, to these facts as a creative transformation that man

can enact on his life:

Собственно я родился странником; странником-проповедником. Так в Иудее, бывало, «целая улица пророчествует». Вот я один из таких; т.е. людей улицы (средних) и «во пророках» <...>. «Пророчество» не есть у меня для русских, т.е. факт истории нашего народа, а мое домашнее обстоятельство, и относится только до меня (без значения и влияния); есть частность моей биографии.

Я решительно не могу остановиться, удержаться, чтобы не говорить (писать): и все мешающее отбрасываю нетерпеливо (дела житейские) или выраниваю из рук (книги).

Эти говоры (шепоты) и есть моя «литература».

[Ued.: 124]

The invocation of the tradition of prophecy is used as a justification of Rozanov's otherwise paradoxical position. He claimed to be seeking to overcome literature, and yet was himself more intimately and tirelessly engaged in its production than almost any of his contemporaries. Rozanov seeks to equate his constant need to write and publish, which he associated with the very features of modernity that he despised, with the continual (spoken) verbal creation of prophecy. He emphasizes the spoken, not the written character of his utterance. The role of prophet and wanderer assures Rozanov the same freedom and lack of accountability as the genre of prayer and solitary self-accounting. In both he has a guarantee in God's will that



frees him from a more worldly answerability.

Rozanov's declaration of himself as a 'wanderer-preacher' (strannik-propovednik) can be seen as a literary device, seeking to reserve for the author both the absolute power of prophecy and the freedoms of a subjective, intimate genre that makes a gesture of denial and unaccountability to the reading public, while ensuring that his words are heard. Rozanov explains his sense of prophecy as the impulse towards verbal creation without textual authority. The assertion of his prophetic destiny gives him, he believes, the freedom to pronounce on the world as he conceives it, without having to be accountable to books. Rozanov argued that this freedom should be open to everyone: no one should hesitate to speak of their own unique experience, silenced by the false authorities of books. Rozanov sought to promote the word as he understood it in its truly sacred interpretation, as freedom, rather than silencing constraint. Each man furthers the sacred life of the word in his own words. This is man's necessary act before God, Rozanov believed. Rozanov argues for a return to man's spontaneous access to God, which he sees as his capacity for prophecy:

Мы угасли дух пророчества в себе. Битие догмата угасило возможность пророчества. Мы чрезвычайно обеднели даже сравнительно с ветхозаветным еврейством. <...> и я и всякий могли бы еще обратиться к Отцу Небесному в нужном случае жизни, не повторяя слова Иисуса, «не приводя

текста», но свое новое творя слово. <...> Я говорю, что слово каждого из нас могло-бы быть вдохновенно <...>.<sup>110</sup>

Rozanov sought a freedom for man from past texts and authorities, to show him that it is his own spontaneous creative word that is his joyful heritage. He believed that even one of the most celebratory texts of the Bible, the 'Song of Songs', had been distorted and rationalized in the hands of the ecclesiastical dogmatists. He imagines himself as a modern prophet of Judaea, proclaiming its true spirit:

О, если бы не те годы (57): с Песнь Песней я побежал бы по улицам и, останавливая юношей, останавливая девушек, говорил бы всем:

- Радость, Радость пришла, Которую скрыли от вас и которая есть: что Священное писание говорит и зовет к поцелуям, чистым, невинным, <...> Ступайте же, омойтесь, очиститесь, помолитесь - и приходите тогда ликовать на улице великую Песнь Песней.<sup>111</sup>

Averintsev explains the variety of possible interpretations of the 'Song of Songs', of which Rozanov's reaction is one, as proof of the endurance and constant renewal of the word in the Near Eastern verbal tradition. He also emphasizes oppositions that are significant for Rozanov's writing, in its attack on established literature:

Слова поэта дают не замкнутую пластику, а разомкнутую

динамику, не форму, а порыв, не расчлененность, а слиянность, не изображение, а выражение, не четкую картину, а проникновенную интонацию. <...> Не случайно на «Песнь Песней» тысячелетиями писали мистические толкования: по самой природе своего поэтического слова она открыта для любых интерпретаций предельно плотского или предельно сакрального характера, ибо ее образность разомкнута и дает жизнь как нечто принципиально нечленимое.<sup>112</sup>

The dynamism, value of impulse (poryv) over form, expressive and penetrative intonation over clearly defined characters and objective description, noted here by Averintsev as distinctive of the Near Eastern tradition, are all features of the way that Rozanov describes his own writing, or the ideal of his writing. Despite urging the freedom of verbal creation for the ordinary man, Rozanov also set himself apart. He asserts the uniqueness of his own prophetic role and claims that he is chosen by God, that this is the origin of his prophetic literary style. This was also a furthering of his freedom from accountability to the here and now:

Отсюда до сих пор (57 лет) сложилось в сущности все мое мирозерцание: я бесконечно отдался *destinationes*, «как Бог хочет», «как из нас растет», «как в нас заложено» <...> Отсюда <...> вырос и мой торжественный слог, - так как «кому открылись *destinationes* - не вправе говорить обыкновенным, уличным языком, а только языком храмовым, ибо

он есть жрец, не людьми поставленный, а Богом избранный: т. к. ему одному открылась воля Божия» <...>.

[Lit. izq.: 343, n.2]

With the authority of a self-prescribed divine possession Rozanov wards off uninitiated and unwanted readers. His words are only for those who will receive them in their original spirit. He places himself beyond temporal judgement since he claims that his words are his destiny, he cannot speak otherwise. The grandiose gesture and high tone also act as a sealing of his exclusive relationship with the readers who will understand him as he does himself. In a passage from Uedinennoe, Rozanov emphasizes his sacredness in God, although even this is claimed as a subjective sensation, not an objective truth. Rozanov even addresses God, as an intimate ('Б. , Боже'), to tell him of this feeling. The reader is posited as a noisy and tiresome interlocutor, interrupting the intimate address to God. His interruption acts as a reminder of the everyday noise of literary life and contrasts with the quiet exultation of Rozanov's 'sacred writing':

Б. всего меня позолотил.

Чувствую это...

Боже, до чего чувствую.

Каждая моя строчка есть священное писание <...> и каждая моя мысль есть священная мысль, и каждое мое слово

есть священное слово.

- Как вы смеете? - кричит читатель.

- Ну вот так и «смею», - смеюсь ему в ответ я.

Я весь «в Провидении»... Боже, до чего я это чувствую.

[Ued.: 96]

The claiming of the freedom of the individual's spiritual accounting is in the Orthodox tradition of prayer. With God's sanction, the man who prays has an absolute freedom of words and speech. Rozanov knew this power of prayer, and takes it into literature: 'Розанов, будь чудом своей земли. И моли Бога, моли Бога, потому что ты сам ничего не можешь, но если Бог с тобой - чудо выйдет.'<sup>113</sup> Confidence of divine sanction allows Rozanov immense daring and freedom. It is the guarantee of his anarchic subjectivity: 'Бог со мной, значит я прав...'. God is the authority in which Rozanov says whatever he likes:

<...> мне часто же казалось ( и может быть, так это и есть), что я самый правдивый и искренний писатель: хоть тут не содержится ни скрупула нравственности.

«Так меня устроил Бог».

[Ued.: 98]

Rozanov resolves his endless need for speech by claiming that it is God's will. God gives his most intimate and subjective words a sacral authority. This is the sense in

which Rozanov understands his prophetic fate. God is the guarantor of the truth of his writing, a defence against accusations of carelessness or self-contradiction. Rozanov's invocation of God's will frees him, in Bakhtinian terms, from his obligations to the reader. He can laugh in the face of the reader, and is not obliged to explain his words. Thus he frees his words from possible completing evaluations that would stall the process of self-uncovery in the sight of God. In the descriptions of his writing process, Rozanov makes frequent reference to this sense of divine possession and involuntary inspiration. In the following passage Rozanov describes his writing as a prophetic possession by God:

Слияние своей жизни, *fatum'a*, особенно мыслей и, главное, писаний, с Божеским «хочу» - было постоянно во мне, с самой юности, даже с отрочества. И отсюда, пожалуй, вытекла моя небрежность. Я потому был небрежен, что какой-то внутренний голос, какое-то непреодолимо внутреннее убеждение мне говорило, что все, что я говорю, - хочет Бог, чтобы я говорил. Не всегда это бывало в одинаковой степени, в одинаковом напряжении: но иногда это убеждение, эта вера доходила до какой-то раскаленности. Я точно весь делался густой, душа делалась густой, мысли совсем приобретали особый строй, и «язык сам говорил». Не всегда в таких случаях бывало перо под рукой: и тогда я выговаривал, что было на душе... Но я чувствовал, что в «выговариваемом» был такой напор силы («густого»), что не могли бы стены

выдержать, сохраниться учреждения, чужие законы, чужие тоже «убеждения»... В такие минуты я чувствовал, что говорю какую-то абсолютную правду, и «под точь-в-точь таким углом наклона», как это есть в мире, в Боге, в «истине в самой себе». Большею частью, однако, это не записалось (не было пера).

[Ued.: 98-99]

The emphasis on the heat of the moment of utterance and the lack of written vestiges is in the tradition of Near Eastern prophecy. Rozanov's subjective prophecy was founded on a great faith in the phenomenon of himself:<sup>114</sup>

Вообще, если разобраться во всех этих коллизиях подробно - и развернуть бы их в том, это была бы величайшая по интересу история, вовсе не биографического значения, а, так сказать, цивилизованного, историко-культурного. По разным причинам я думаю, что это «единственный раз» в истории случилось, и я не могу отделаться от чувства, что это - провиденциально.<sup>115</sup>

По сложности и количеству мыслей (точек зрения, узора мысленной ткани) я считаю себя первым. Мне иногда кажется, что я понял всю историю так, как бы «держу ее в руке», как бы историю я сам сотворил, - с таким чувством уроднения и полного постижения.

[Smert.: 151]

The creative freedom and invention of Rozanov's words are so much an assertion of self that at times God and God's word seem relegated to dependence on Rozanov's summons: 'Авраама призвал Бог: а я сам призвал Бога... Вот вся разница.' [Ued.: 79]

### IURODSTVO

Iurodstvo, although not conventionally described as a verbal genre like prayer and prophesy, is nevertheless a very important part of the Russian Orthodox verbal tradition, and rooted in its Near Eastern religious origins.<sup>116</sup> Critics used the term iurodstvo to approach the more outspoken, outrageous and capricious aspects of Rozanov's writing.<sup>117</sup> Bakhtin describes iurodstvo as a form of verbal creation in 'Avtor i geroi v esteticheskoi deiatel'nosti'. Iurodstvo guarantees an unprecedented freedom of speech in defiance of authority and immediate, secular answerability. It could equally be a shielding device from external valuation, a way of challenging the reader and deflecting his expectations. Bakhtin writes about the use of such literary iurodstvo in Zapiski iz podpol'ia. It can mean a refusal to submit to the judgement of the reader, and even to God:

Возможен богоборческий и человекоборческий момент в самоотчете-исповеди, неприятие возможного суда божеского и человеческого, и отсюда тон злобы, недоверия, цинизма,



иронии, вызова. (Юродству почти всегда присущ человекоборческий элемент, цинический выверт юродства; вызывающая, дразнящая откровенность.)

Такова исповедь и откровенность перед человеком, которого презираешь, у Достоевского <...>.<sup>118</sup>

Bakhtin describes literary iurodstvo as a refusal to reckon with other evaluating consciousnesses but one's own. Iurodstvo is a denial of the other's completing authority, the only authority it recognizes is that of God. This does not, however, threaten the absolute freedom of speech. The iurodivye, or fools in God, were understood as having a divine dispensation for words that could be contradictory and logically incoherent, but particularly for challenging or upbraiding members of society who were traditionally considered irreproachable. The iurodivyi is allowed this freedom in the name of truth and God. Yet absolute licence of speech could be interpreted, in its modern context, as cynicism; Rozanov's openness was branded 'cynicism' by his critics.

Iurodstvo was a form in which penetrating criticisms could be justified by a sacred naivety. It is the lack of temporal calculation that allows the iurodivyi freedom of speech. He is not meant to understand the full import of what he says, and yet he speaks straight to the heart of the matter, not reckoning with the anticipated reactions of others. In Rozanov's writing, besides the openness that was seen as cynicism, there are also the tones of innocence

in God, the self-accounting that finds refuge and absolution in God - the process that Bakhtin describes as becoming 'naive in God':

Предвосхищая верою оправдание в боге, я мало-помалу из я-для-себя становлюсь другим для бога, наивным в боге. На этой стадии религиозной наивности находятся псалмы (также многие христианские гимны и молитвы); становится возможным ритм, милующий и возвышающий образ и проч. - успокоение, строй и мера в антиципации красоты в боге.<sup>119</sup>

Naivety in God is the moment in which one gives up the critical attack of self-accounting for oneself, and finds freedom and release in God. In this way the tones of penitence and self-condemnation become more joyous and assertive. This act of faith is necessary for Rozanov, to allow him the freedom of self-expression in his work, to free him from the constant process of self-doubt and self-condemnation. The movement between these moods is a rhythm of the opavshie list'ia genre. Rozanov associates religion with naivety. He frequently describes himself as a 'little boy' in his faith. Religion was a way of overcoming the contemporary obligation for exhaustive knowledge: 'Без психологического момента веры, без способности уповать, надеяться, без некоторой святой наивности - невозможна вообще религия'.<sup>120</sup>

Mandel'shtam describes the creative freedom of the artist as a playfulness with God. Redemption has already

taken place, in Christ's sacrifice, it is in imitation of this first act that artists recreate the illusion of redemption, the stages of catharsis and redemption in their art, but this is seen as God's game with man who has already been set free:

Христианское искусство свободно. <...>. Никакая необходимость, даже самая высокая, не омрачает его светлой внутренней свободы, ибо прообраз его, то чему оно подражает, есть само искупление мира Христом. Итак, не жертва, не искупление в искусстве, а свободное и радостное подражание Христу - вот краеугольный камень христианской эстетики. <...> мир вместе с художником уже искуплен, - что же остается? Радостное богообщение, как бы игра Отца с детьми, жмурки и прятки духа! <...> Вся наша двухтысячелетняя культура, благодаря чудесной милости христианства, есть отпущение мира на свободу для игры, для духовного веселья, для свободного «подражания Христу».<sup>121</sup>

Similarly, Rozanov describes his own writing as a playful game with God that takes place 'in God's playground':

Но я шалунок у Бога. Я люблю шалить. Шалость, маленькие игры (душевные) - мое постоянное состояние. Когда я не играю, мне очень скучно, и потому я почти постоянно играю. Глупости, фантазии, мелочи, сор, забавы. <...> Вся моя душа - не омраченная. Никогда. <...>

Играют же собаки на дворе. И я «собака Божия»,

играющая «на Божьем дворе», и никогда не хотящая с него уйти.

Я люблю Б.

Больше всего я его люблю.

Люблю его двор. Ужасно люблю.

Я счастлив.<sup>122</sup>

Both writers emphasize the need to rejoice in worldly surroundings. They emphasize man's need to recognize his freedom, and not enslave himself to a sense of sinfulness. Mandel'shtam describes God the Father as a benevolent overseer of his innocent and playful children. This was very close to Rozanov's own depiction of his God, and in his writing he created a role for himself as a child both playful and irresponsible, because innocent in God.

Another feature of Rozanov's literary iurodstvo is a constant uncovering of deceits, a frank outspokenness of even the most intimate details. Rozanov described his writing as a nakedness. In Posle Sakharny, he describes going naked before the people, thereby making a literary gesture of a spiritual device displayed with vivid literalness by medieval saints and holy men.<sup>123</sup> Tearing off one's clothes before the people symbolized the relinquishing of all worldly authority, and yet at the same time had a commanding psychological power. What was a literal show of self-abasement and ultimate humility could be a clever and politic assertion. Rozanov makes this literalness a literary device. His literary nakedness is a

symbolic protest against the intellectual hypocrisy of contemporary Russian culture. In an article on Dostoevskii's Zapiski iz podpol'ia, Rozanov compares the protagonist with a naked man, 'in the bath-house':

«Человек бывает в двух видах: в департаменте, на балу; но бывает еще в бане. Я люблю человека в бане. Тогда я вижу его всего и без прикрас. <...> ».

Вот тезис Достоевского, тон исповедования «подпольного человека», тон самого Достоевского. «Когда вы строите «человеческое счастье», то вы строите его собственно для одевшегося человека, <...>. Это скучно и неверно. <...> Просто, - не удовлетворится голый человек, «в натуре»; купец в бане и я в подполье. Вы построите искусственное счастье для сочиненного человека, для искусственного человека, для вами выдуманного человека. Просто, и вы притворяетесь, когда сочиняете теории, и притворяются ваши читатели, когда делают вид, что им верят. Сбросьте притворство, вот как я, и получите критику, хохот и диалектику «подпольного человека».<sup>124</sup>

Rozanov protests his innocence and self-sacrifice for people by his willingness to bare all in his writing, to restore to people what is spontaneous, Russian and sacred. In a characteristic identification of the development of civilization with the Fall of man, Rozanov urges a return to a supposedly original 'naked' source of knowledge, unashamed of its innocence:

<...> мы совершенно забыли первозданный в себе образ Божий; мы все тщимся прикрыть его одеянными внешней, заимствованной цивилизации. Мы не доверяем в себе этому прекрасному первозданному лику, мы его презираем, мы, наконец, возненавидели его. И вот от какого первородного греха нашей ложной цивилизации нас гонит дальше и дальше мучительный стыд; и закрываем мы лицо свое перед другими народами; и убегаем их тем мучительнее, чем ближе, повидимому, к ним подходим по внешности, чем больше набрасываем на себя одежд и глубже и глубже прячем под ними свою «презренную» наготу, - ту прекрасную наготу, которую нам дал Бог...<sup>125</sup>

For Rozanov, the false clothings of knowledge protect people from genuine spiritual perception. Gershenzon used a similar image in a letter of 1912 to Rozanov praising his Uedinennoe:

<...> даже непостижимо, как это Вы сумели так совсем не надеть на себя системы, схемы, <...> - и как у Вас хватило смелости в 20-м веке, где все ходят одеты в систему, в последовательность, в доказательность, рассказать вслух и публично свою наготу. Конечно, в сущности все голы, но часть не знают этого сами и уж во всяком случае наружу прикрывают себя.<sup>126</sup>

Conventional formulas of thought are seen as sinful

coverings, a continuation of Adam and Eve's actions after eating from the Tree of Knowledge. Rozanov praises Leont'ev's originality by comparing him to Adam, naked before the Fall, in a crowd of literary masks: 'Человек был в словах весь - как Адам без одежды.'<sup>127</sup>

Prishvin, who acknowledged Rozanov's profound influence on his life and who devoted much of his diary to an elucidation of this influence towards which he was ambiguous, emphasized the religious source of Rozanov's literary nakedness:

Он позволял себе все средства, чтобы отстоять свою индивидуальность, как в жизни, так и в литературе. Во всей русской и, может быть, мировой литературе, нет такого писателя, который мог бы так обнажаться.<sup>128</sup>

Истоки обнажения Розанова: 1) религиозный, 2) простая любовь к общению (быту).<sup>129</sup>

Rozanov's literary 'nakedness' was a way in which he ensured for himself freedom to attack established conventions much as the iurodivyi might act against official church or state hierarchies. Rozanov imitates this iurodstvo, claiming divine authority even for his most outrageous words. For Bakhtin, iurodstvo is a way to maintain an endless non-coincidence of self, to avoid the finalization of others' constrictive definitions. It preserves the purity of one's self-relation, of writing for

oneself, and a freedom of potential new utterance:

Эта борьба с ценностной позицией другого своеобразным образом ставит проблему внешней формы в самоотчете-исповеди; здесь неизбежен конфликт с формой и с самим языком выражения <...> (корни *иуродства* как формы принципиального отрицания значимости формы выражения).<sup>130</sup>

Стыд ритма и формы - корень *иуродства*, гордое одиночество и противление другому, самосознание, перешедшее границы и желающее очертить вокруг себя неразрывный круг.<sup>131</sup>

For Bakhtin and Rozanov *iurodstvo* represented a resistance to pre-conceived forms of expression, an attempt to counteract the constrictions of given form. They, and many of their contemporaries, were engaged in a bid to find productive forms of thought that would free expression from the constraint of previous systems and categories, adopted from Western philosophy. Bakhtin's work was itself in many ways an extension of these philosophical traditions, in which he had been educated. Rozanov's battle with system and form was far more polemical, he waged the campaign in his articles and footnotes and in the self-consciously 'unformed' structure of his *opavshie list'ia* genre.



CHAPTER II: FORMS OF EXPRESSION AND UNDERSTANDING INROZANOV'S APPROACH TO THE WORDTHE PROBLEM OF FORM

Form was an important part of the debate on the word in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in Russia. There was a general recognition of the need to evolve new forms for thought in order to develop Russia's individual philosophical tradition. Rozanov was engaged in this debate in his articles and in his own work. Yet he suggested that Russia's nature was contradictory, defying logical development:

Вся наша (русская) история - особенно в эти два века, и чем далее, тем хуже - носит характер хаотичности; все в ней «обильно», «широко» - и все «не устроено»; мы как бы живем афоризмами, не пытая связать их в систему, и даже не замечая, что все наши афоризмы противоречат друг-другу; так что мы собственно, наше духовное я - не определимы, не уловимы для мысли, и вот почему мы - не развиваемся.

[Lit. izq.: 492-93]

Despite the pessimistic tone, Rozanov's comments are expressive of important and intentional features of his own writing, his own principled contradiction and resistance of definition. Rozanov recognized a vitality in Russia's formlessness, yielding true prophets:

Азия безформена и глубока. Оттуда, не забудем, пришли не поддельные, а подлинные пророки; мудрость, высочайшее постижение жизни. В «халатном универсе» и содержится, при подобной же азиатской безформенности, много золотой мечты, высочайшего - и притом жизненного, практического, осуществленного - идеализма.<sup>1</sup>

Rozanov recognized the dangers of Russia's chaotic nature, but he sought to defend the source of vitality that he saw as Russia's nature against rigid, outwardly imposed forms. In language and society Rozanov identified the beginning of degeneration with the moment when the artifice of form begins to take over from the content or 'spirit' of a thing:

Совершенство формы есть преимущество падающих эпох.

Когда народ умирает - он оставляет одни формы: это - скелет его духа, его творчества, его движений внутренних и внешних. <...> И вот почему, еще раз: когда народ оканчивает свое существование - формальная сторона всех им создаваемых вещей приближается к своему завершению.<sup>2</sup>

Rozanov identified this process in areas of language as disparate as that of Church ritual and the poetry of the decadents:

Повсюду, во всех ее линиях, жизнь наша облеклась в

христианскую терминологию, при исчезновении духа христианства <...>.

[Lit. izg.: 490]

Декаденство - это ultra без того, к чему оно относилось бы; это - утрировка без утрируемого; вычурность в форме при исчезнувшем содержании: без рифм, без размера, однако же и без смысла «поэзия» - вот decadence.<sup>3</sup>

Yet in 1909 Rozanov was optimistic about that the 'soul' of a writer's work would prove more compelling than external form: 'Более и более пропадает интерес к форме литературных произведений, как некоторому искусственному построению, условно нравящемуся в данную эпоху, и нарастает интерес к душе их, т. е. к той задушевной внутренней мысли автора, с которого он писал свое произведение.'<sup>4</sup> This was the direction that he hoped writing and criticism would follow.

In a footnote to a letter from Strakhov, Rozanov contrasts the formally structured edifice (postroika) with the spontaneous impulse (polet) in writing:

Повидимому, есть два вида писательства: 1) полет, 2) постройка. В корне их лежит вечныя начала человеческого духа - пророчествовать, философствовать. Надежны книги и вообще писатели только вторых, а первые лишь увлекают и творят жизнь. Страхов принадлежит к строителям, как обратно напр. Влад. Соловьев - к полетчикам.

[Lit. izg.: 223, n.1]

Despite his claim that structured philosophical thought was more 'reliable', Rozanov's instinctive sympathy was for the stimulating and creative impulse of prophecy, which he felt to be so lacking in an age already overburdened with 'reliable' academic philosophies. Strakhov, however, accused Rozanov of a dangerous impulsiveness and lack of concentration in his writing. He wrote to him: 'Зачем Вам разбрасываться и истощать свои силы на порывистое писание и чтение.' [Lit. izq.: 118] Rozanov countered that his writing was a responsibility to the many contradictory thoughts that motivated him. The only way to be true to this in writing was to write in 'many tones':

<...> мечты, и опять самой разнообразной - была бездна; мечтаний - противоположных, <...> - откуда и рождалась «возможность всех тонов». Вообще мне нужно было сокращать себя, убавлять «я» в «я» и еще в «я»; упрощаться... Эту множественность «я» в «я» Страхов и принимал за «порывистость», «невладение собою», «восхваление своих недостатков». Тут было «не тот адрес», и не то имя.

[Lit. izq.: 351, n.1]

Rozanov defended his impulse (poryv) almost as a philosophical principle. He uses the same term, poryv, when writing of the source of prayer and religion, and of sexuality. He admires the holy but 'mistaken' impulse of the heretics.<sup>5</sup> The constant renewal of the spiritual, creative impulse prevents the ossification and formal

perfection which is an historical and cultural death. Rozanov writes of his own work:

Если мой ум и не будет помниться (м.б. не стоит) - мой порыв будет помниться. История «моего сердца» не пройдет в литературе русской <...>.<sup>6</sup>

«Ум» христианский, «рассуждение» христианское - исчерпано, и, быть может, истощено; сердце христианское, порыв христианский, музыка души христианской не пробуждена, и она может бесконечно жить и бесконечное, кажется, может сотворить...<sup>7</sup>

Rozanov interpreted the phenomenon of sectarianism in Russian religious life as the rebellion of frustrated initiative and creative energy, and sees it as emblematic of a far more widespread phenomenon:

Духоборчество есть симптом, показующий и отрицающий великую пассивность всех наших духовных состояний <...>. Невыносимо это для души человеческой, <...> невыносимо, говорим мы, потому что природа души человеческой есть жизнь, акция, инициатива, потому что душа есть Божия тайна, и именно тайна - творческая. Между тем у нас все творчество, всякая инициатива, акция взята формами - увы, оскопившимися духа формами! <...> дайте сотворить человеку, иначе он умрет и «завертится». Но чтобы он не вертелся, чтобы он не уродствовал - откройте ему для творчества благородные

формы.<sup>8</sup>

In all areas of life, Rozanov argues, there is no outlet for the spontaneous creative impulse of the ordinary man. If the Church ignored man's need to pray about the everyday, and literature was remote from the details of ordinary experience, the sense of living prayer would be lost, and the consequences of spiritual frustration catastrophic. Rozanov saw his own writing as a way to respond to the 'creative secret' of man's life.

Rozanov continually defended his own lack of form, both in his writing and as a characteristic of his own life. The evasion of a defined form was a guarantee of vigour and potential for future life:

- Да просто я не имею формы (causa formalis Аристотеля). Какой-то «комок» или «мочалка». Но это от того, что я весь - дух, и весь - субъект: субъективное развито во мне бесконечно, как я не знаю ни у кого, не предполагал ни у кого.

[Ued.: 55]

The spirit, dukh, according to Bakhtin, is the formative, but unformed principle, it is an undefined energy of becoming. A person lives out towards others in spirit (dukh), but only receives a formed soul (dusha) as a grace of the other's completion of his/her ever-emergent being.<sup>9</sup> If the person resists this, he/she remains in a state of

ever-striving spirit, endless subjectivity, defying completion:

<...> душа и все формы эстетического воплощения внутренней жизни (ритм) и формы данного мира, эстетически соотнесенного с душой, принципиально не могут быть формами чистого самовыражения, выражения себя и своего, но являются формами отношения к другому и к его самовыражению.<sup>10</sup>

Rozanov sought to avoid reckoning with this other, which would impose a possible definition on his words. His writing continually states its almost programmatic contradiction and evasion of definition. Lack of definition is a refuge as it promises endless becoming and endless writing.

#### WRITING AND THE MOVEMENTS OF THE SOUL

Rozanov claimed that he was unable ever to plan or structure an article before writing, it had to 'write itself' according to his inspiration. At times this yielded results that even Rozanov recognized did not express his argument in the most lucid way possible for the reader. However, he was unable to accept even the smallest alterations in the interests of clarity and was forced to reinstate the original, if chaotic, statements, as being truer to the moment of writing:

Ничего в жизни никогда не обрабатывал, кроме двух единственных статей: «Цель человеческой жизни» и «О трех принципах человеческой деятельности» (редакции 3-4 каждой): и оне - тянутся томительно, как мочалка.

[Lit. izg.: 200, n.2]

Есть некоторая непрерывность, сплошность, целостность литературных произведений, зависящая от единства вызвавшего их настроения, которая делает их непоправимыми, даже если оне и исполнены недостатков. <...> в моих статьях полно и без изменений отражена моя душа во всех ея настроениях и оттенках этих настроений, уродливых и правильных, печальных и светлых, но бывших и, следовательно, живых; ибо быть отраженным - конечно верно - это и есть главная цель писателя, при которой все прочия для него побочны. <...>

<...> Литература, вся литература есть регистрация живых фактов; есть ряд как-бы окаменелостей, из которых каждая была некогда жизнью. Ее изменить именно в форме, именно в черте сложения, в запятой, синтаксисе - значит убить тот древний факт и на месте его поставить фикцию, никогда не бывшее. Но когда живая душа еще помнит тот факт, несет в себе его побледневшую, но точную форму, - она всеми силами сопротивляется его изменению и отвергает все «лучшее» как фикцию, которая, может быть, и прекрасна, но никогда не была рождена.<sup>11</sup>

This letter to the editors of Russkoe obozrenie, written in 1896, anticipates the central concerns of Rozanov's



writing; his concentration on the living moment of thought, which alone contains truth. Bakhtin also emphasized the moment of experience as the sole source of value that could not be defined:

В определенности моего переживания для меня самого (определенности чувства, желания, стремления, мысли) ничего не может быть ценного, кроме заданного смысла и предмета, который осуществлялся, которым жило переживание.<sup>12</sup>

Rozanov emphasizes writing's responsibility to convey as directly as possible the original moment of experience. He sought to defy the ossification that he believed was the danger of literary transcription. As he writes in his introduction to Uedinennoe:

<...> жизнь в быстротечном времени срывает с души нашей восклицания, вздохи, полумысли, получувства... Которые, будучи звуковыми обрывками, имеют ту значительность, что «сошли» прямо с души, без переработки, без цели, без преднамеренья, - без всего постороннего... Просто, - «душа живет» ... т.е. «жила», «дохнула»... С давнего времени мне эти «нечаянные восклицания» почему-то нравились.

[Ued.: 36]

The opavshie list'ia genre seeks to embody the literary principle expressed in Rozanov's 1896 letter to Russkoe obozrenie, to be a record of the living experience, to be

faithful in style to its origin.<sup>13</sup> Rozanov warned against the danger of literary transcription to the spontaneous energy of the spoken word. This is repeatedly described as a 'cooling' and 'freezing' process in the life of the word:<sup>14</sup>

Не литература, а литературность ужасна; литературность души, литературность жизни. То, что всякое переживание переливается в играющее, живое слово: но этим все и кончается, - самое переживание умерло, нет его. Температура (человека, тела) остыла от слова. Слово не возбуждает, о нет! оно - расхолаживает и останавливает.

[О. 1. I.: 171]

Rozanov described his ideal of writing as a spontaneous dynamism. It should be transient but invigorating, returning the reader to life more forcefully:

Литература тем поразительная вещь, что это - сгорающая до тла, без остатка вещь: искры из трубы парохода, которые гаснут на ветре. <...> Литература - живая вода; глотни - «и не умрешь». Только? - Только. Пустое? - Нет, самое важное: кровь в жилах утружденных, голубой огонек небесной искры, бегущий по нервам, и вдруг усталое «вчера» преобразующий в бодрое «завтра».<sup>15</sup>

Rozanov made his diverse and tangential trains of thought the source of his writing's vitality. His writing

was an explicit attempt to follow the movements of thought, without imposing argument and structure. It is an attempt to show the process of thought in all its hesitation, spontaneity and self-contradiction. Yet Rozanov realized that this nevertheless remained a literary process. He became increasingly aware of the difficulties involved in attempting a true reflection of thought and soul, 'in all its moods and in the shades of these moods'<sup>16</sup> and yet printing this as literature, and this debate itself became a part of his writing.

Rozanov claimed to convey the spontaneous expression of his thoughts in his writing. Yet he gives a misleading impression of his writing process. The printed proof-sheets that remain show his own handwritten deletions, amendments and alterations. This is more evident in his opavshie list'ia writings than in his articles, yet it was precisely these writings that claimed to embody the chance and spontaneous process of utterance. It was as though the writing that Rozanov wanted to be truest of all to the origin of his thought demanded the most attentive preparation. This is one of the paradoxes of his opavshie list'ia: both the most anti-literary and supremely literary writing of its time. In his bid to reproduce, uniquely in literature, the spontaneous moments of thought and speech, Rozanov is in fact developing complex literary devices that were a great spur to the formal and stylistic development of Russian writing.

In an analysis of the 'modernist' style of Rozanov,

Remizov and Belyi, Levin emphasizes the refined artistry and supremely literary nature of the seemingly spontaneous living and non-literary speech.<sup>17</sup> He analyses Rozanov's style primarily through the opavshie list'ia genre. Rozanov's attempt to reproduce the movement and multiplicity of living thoughts in literature gave a radically new appearance to the text. Not only was each page given over to a chance thought, perhaps only a sentence, a jotting, but the words themselves were often indeed 'half-words', half-uttered, not pedantically explained for the reader. Rozanov frequently used abbreviations, bracketings, italics and quotation marks to be true to the shifts and abbreviations in his own thoughts, and to reveal how others' words or phrases (in quotation marks) could stimulate a train of thought in his mind. The effect is very dense, as Rozanov shows the knot of thought, with all the associations, half-thoughts, and asides that a particular reflection contains. He manages to do this and not lose his reader, by a skilful use of bracketing and notation. Levin describes this use of punctuation as a modernist literary device. The counterpoint to this density and flurries of thought are the pauses, the gaps. These are indicated by spaces on the page, by dashes and by ellipsis, which very effectively convey the moment where thought breaks off in bewilderment or exhaustion, before resuming its 'ceaseless noise'.<sup>18</sup> The pause must be eloquent. Rozanov emphasizes its importance in a passage criticizing Solov'ev's use of the word: 'Надо

бы проследить, есть ли у него «восклицательные знаки» и «многоточия» - симптомы души в рукописании и печати. Очень бы любопытно.<sup>19</sup> He makes a sharper comment in an article attacking the critic Mikhailovskii: '«многоточие» - то и есть единственно глубокомысленная и даже единственная думающая часть «Мыслей о религии»'.<sup>20</sup>

### STYLISTIC INCOHERENCE

Rozanov defended himself against accusations of incoherence, arguing that the order which the reading public might be seeking was a false prejudice, a literary habit, the result of unquestioning laziness. He attacked the superficial approach of readers who were intolerant of a lack of form, arguing that the more profound inquiries might yield less conventional formulations: 'Несерьезность широких масс нашего читающего общества и господствующих течений нашей литературы ярко сказалась в том, что ни первое, ни вторая не сумели рассмотреть мысли, которая заключена была не в блестящих формах.'<sup>21</sup> In a letter to Leont'ev, Rozanov condoned a lack of system as indicative of profundity: 'Отсутствие систематичности у Вас (не в мышлении, но в изложении) неотделимо от прелестнейших сторон Вашей литературной манеры; но именно она и есть виновница, что Ваши идеи (для глупцов, конечно) не кажутся научны.'<sup>22</sup>

Dostoevskii was an important example for Rozanov. He too defended the importance of the unclear and unresolved

regions of thought that could not always be expressed in a clear or logical form. Rozanov maintained, like Dostoevskii, that the awkwardness of an idea's expression does not detract from its profundity. He writes about the structure of Dostoevskii's Zimnie zametki o letnikh vpechatleniakh: 'в несколько беспорядочной по виду, но, в сущности, глубоко связанной и сосредоточенной статье'.<sup>23</sup> Rozanov also defended the chaotic aspects of Dostoevskii's literary style:

Все прощают великие недостатки собственно живописи у него; точнее - гармонии в живописи, которая лишь в отдельных вершинах несет на себе краски точно какого-то иного мира, а на сплошном полотне своем являет рытвины, пустыни, обвалы и пустыри. Все это забывают: ибо слишком ясно, что центр личности его - не в эстетике, а в мышлении, <...>.<sup>24</sup>

The description of the geography of Dostoevskii's writing is comparable to Rozanov's own self-description:<sup>25</sup>

.....  
 .....

Вывороченные шпалы. Шашки. Песок. Камень. Рытвины.

- Что это? - ремонт мостовой?

- Нет, это «Сочинения Розанова».

[O. I. I: 179]

Rozanov saw the seeming chaos and contradiction of his

style as an attempt to be true to his meaning in a way that had never been done before. He wanted to show that the systematizers were falsifiers of meaning. His chaos was a principled chaos, and the source of his writing's vitality. He believed that Dostoevskii's works answered important contemporary needs, because of, not in spite of, their exploration of fragmentation in both content and form. Even Strakhov, who himself applied such stringent criticism to Rozanov's literary style, recognized that the chaotic forms of literature were a true expression of contemporary cultural life that defied logical or coherent form:

Давно уже знаком мне Петербург. <...> Какой страшный хаос! Какия изумительныя уродливости недорослей, подавленной, изгибающейся мысли! Какия дикия невероятныя формы! Какия антилогические сплетения и сочетания! Но в то же время я чувствовал, что чем безобразнее этот мир, тем, кажется, несправедливее прилагать к нему мерку правильной и чистой мысли. <...> и я понял, что в глубине этого туманного мира безобразных мыслей все-таки скрываются горячие источники жизни. <...> Безумец тот, кто приступил бы к этому миру с требованием правильных форм и мыслей <...>. Но еще более безумец тот, кто стал бы упрекать этот мир за его безобразие, и вместо сожаления и сочувствия, казнил бы его сарказмом и презрением!<sup>26</sup>

Strakhov regretted this necessary chaos. Other thinkers saw it as an important reality to which thought

must respond. Shestov was perhaps the most driven and least compromising of the philosophers engaged in this search. Like Strakhov, he recognized that contemporary reality was no longer susceptible to logical analysis. He wrote that fragmented, chaotic and contradictory thought had become the only possible form of expression. Man would only free himself from the limitations that his intellectual enquiry had reached by radically changing the form of this enquiry:

По мере того, как растёт недоверие к последовательности и сомнение в пригодности всякого рода общих идей, не должно ли явиться у человека отвращение и к той форме изложения, которая наиболее приспособлена к существующим предрассудкам.<sup>27</sup>

<...> незаконченные, беспорядочные, хаотические, не ведущие к заранее поставленной разумом цели, противоречивые, как сама жизнь, размышления - разве они не ближе нашей душе, нежели системы, хотя бы и великие системы, творцы которых не столько заботились о том, чтобы узнать действительность, сколько о том, чтобы «понять ее»?<sup>28</sup>

Rozanov shared Shestov's antipathy to philosophical system, his value for man's cry of anguish, for the prophets and psalms of the Old Testament. He emphasized the significance of contradiction, emotive cries and seeming chaos in his own work. However the refusal of order by writers such as



Shestov and Rozanov was disturbing, and frequently treated with scepticism by contemporaries. Later writers emphasized the value of Rozanov's fragmentary form as a deepening, not scattering, of thought.<sup>29</sup>

Rozanov saw his writing as counteracting the tendency towards a centripetal, rhetorical and monologic culture which seeks to impose one truth over a multiplicity of many various viewpoints and truths. He accused Christ of imposing a monologic truth on the plurality of life and language:

Христос разрушил мир, воистину - разрушил <...>. Уничтожением «противостояний», «противоположений», «контрафорсов». <...> Что сделалось с европейской цивилизацией - как «системой мира», системой отношений: как если бы из космогонии вынуть центробежную силу и оставить одну центростремительную. <...>. Контр-форсы, контр-форсы - без этого мир не стоит. Христос же, «единою любовью покоривший все», на самом деле и сознательно все разрушил.<sup>30</sup>

In a review of Berdiaev's book Smysl tvorchestva, Rozanov attacks Berdiaev's attempt to achieve a formal unity that will overcome the contradictions that Rozanov believes are essential to life. He describes his own dynamic, anti-systematic view of the world:

<...> он говорит, что мир есть «разлад» <...>. Он хочет из

«разлада» выставить на лоно какого-то «покоя», где <...> сон и сытость философствующего буржуа...

<...> Да что нам философы, когда перед нами Бог, который через действие на планету сил «центробежной» и «центростремительной» устроил их бег по «орбите», уже наверно прекраснейшей и твердейшей, чем всякая метафизика... <...> по какому-то мотиву Вседержитель хотел, чтобы мир шел, жил, бежал, летел... Верно, и существо Вседержителя - летучее, летящее, ибо Он всему дал полет.<sup>31</sup>

Thus the flight of inspiration (polet) that Rozanov counterposed to formal structure in writing is here given a divine sanction. God seeks this 'flight' in man's activity, it is God-given. Rozanov believed that this was the quality in his work that gave it authority against the detractors of his structure and argument. Holquist and Clark also use the idea of centrifugal and centripetal forces to emphasize the central dynamic of Bakhtin's view of the world:

At the heart of Bakhtin's work is a recognition of existence as a ceaseless activity, an enormous energy, which is constantly in the process of being produced by the very forces it drives. This energy may be conceived as a force field created by the ceaseless struggle between centrifugal forces, which strive to keep things various, separate, apart, different from each other, and centripetal forces, which strive to keep things together, unified,

same. Centripetal forces compel movement, becoming, and history; they long for change and new life. Centripetal forces urge stasis, resist becoming, abhor history, and desire the seamless quiet of death.<sup>32</sup>

For Bakhtin this battle was taking place constantly in spoken and written language. The centrifugal energies of speech seek to counteract the centralizing and monologic forces of a dominant ideological system. This system was more of a political reality for Bakhtin than for Rozanov. However, Rozanov sensed the threat of man's attraction to such a single ideological system, whether in the form of an authoritarian religion or in the slogans of radical socialist theory. He realized that this attraction to a unitary language of truth that does not allow for uncertainty or multiple viewpoints was as strong in man as his need to contradict these canons and speak spontaneously. He spoke of wanting to break up the ground of preconceived ideas in his reader's consciousness, to further an empathy to the multitude of opinions. He was not interested in presenting a coherent argument:

Что, однако, для себя, я хотел бы во влиянии?

Психологичности. Вот этой ввинчивости мысли в душу человеческую - и рассыпчатости, разрыхленности их собственной души (т. е. у читателя). На «образ мыслей» я нисколько не хотел бы влиять; на «убеждения» - даже «и не подумаю». Тут мое глубокое «все равно». <...> Так. обр.,

«мое влияние» было бы в расширении души человеческой, в том, что «дышит всем» душа, что она «вбирает в себя все».

[O. I. I: 255]

#### NOMINALISM AND THE WORD MADE FLESH

Rozanov's resistance of system and a unitary order was underlain by his aversion to abstract principles. Such abstraction was at its most insidious in relation to the most immediate indicator of conscious life, to the word itself. Rozanov condemned man's attraction to abstract systems of thought built from abstract verbal concepts. He saw this as a spirit of 'nominalism', pervading all aspects of contemporary life. Rozanov feared that words were no longer engaged with the reality of life. He claimed that life degenerates when no longer given vital expression in language. The emptiness of language leads to the loss of a tangible sense of living 'things', which were sacred. Rozanov sees this as equivalent to a loss of God. Words without flesh attempt to fill the emptiness left by tangible 'things'. Nominalism was an attack on the life of the word made flesh, which Rozanov also interpreted as a direct attack on the life of the flesh, the central source of culture, whose root is in religion:

Великий дефект решительно всего нашего мирозерцания лежит в расторжении и отнесении на противоположные полюсы кажущегося «идеального» и кажущегося же «животного». Оно

стало «общим местом» наших суждений; начавшись религией, овладев философией <...>, оно подчинило себе и практику будней нашего бытия. <...> это ввело подлог в наш «идеальный мир», заменив в нем кровные мысли фикциями, <...>. Мы поклоняемся пустоте; в то же время не поклоняемая более жизнь, естественно, сперва мутнеет, потом дегенирует, «обратно развивается», становясь «рудиментарным привеском» высоких фикций нашего бытия.<sup>33</sup>

Rozanov explained the schism of the Russian Church by a spirit of nominalism. The dispute was over words and dogma, motivated by a fear of life and of the words that are adequate to this living life:

В чем был испуг Никона, та первоначальная психология, которая положила начало всему последующему движению, вековому и кровавому? Да это была та же самая психология и тот же самый испуг, какой издревле и поднесь владеет старообрядцами: тот же круг интересов <...>. Вся эта область - вербальная (verbum=slovo), словесная, а - не эссенциальная, не существенная, до вещи, до «religio» относящаяся. Только в пространстве пустом, где вовсе не было «вещи» религии, rei religionis, или, что то же, при явно покинувшем нас Боге, мог возникнуть этот спор о словах. Ну, вещей нет, тогда будем заниматься словами.<sup>34</sup>

Rozanov experienced the shortcomings of the Church personally, in its refusal to recognize his second 'wife'

and their six children. He makes this reply to the Church:

« <...> Бог со мною. И религия во мне. И в судьбе. Вся судьба и «свелась» для этого мгновения.»

<...> Бога в вас нет, и у вас нет, ничего нет, кроме слов... обещаний, надежд, пустоты и звона. Все вы и вся полнота ваших средств и орудий, ваших богатств и библиотек, учености и мудрости, и самых, как вы говорите, «благодатных таинств», не могут сотворить капельку добра, живого, наличного, реального, если оно ново в веках, не по шаблону и прежде бывавшим примерам <...>.

[Q. 1. I: 155]

Rozanov explains the Church's attachment to dogma as the reason that he developed an intensely personal form of prayer and religion independently of the Church. This is one of the reasons for his sympathy towards heretics. Rozanov sees heresy as an outlet for man's actual, not theoretical religious needs:

Все ереси и самое еретичество и произошло из этого догматизирования, догматизма.<sup>35</sup>

Типикон спасения - вот тайна раскола, нерв его жизни, его мучительная жажда, в отличие от *summa regulorum*, которою руководится наша, да и всякая, впрочем, церковь. Раскол полон живого, личного, художественного <...>.<sup>36</sup>

He interpreted the revival of the sectarian movement as the expression of man's need for a spontaneous religious life and words. In his articles on the sectarian movements Rozanov makes his most explicit attacks on the state of the Orthodox Church, in particular its verbal stagnation. Yet Rozanov believed that the Church still had a vitally important role in the life of the word, its words were desperately needed by people. It is the last possible source of warmth in a world frozen up by empty rhetoric. This is why the threat of this rhetoric penetrating the Church is so insidious:

Церковь об умершем произнесла такие удивительные слова, каких мы не умеем произнести об умершем отце, сыне, жене, подруге.

[Q. 1. II: 429]

Как не целовать руку у Церкви, если она и безграмотному дала способ молитвы: зажгла лампадку старуха темная, старая и сказала: «Господи, помилуй» (слыхала в церкви, да и «сама собою» скажет), и положила поклон в землю.

И «помолилась» и утешилась. Легче стало на душе у одинокой, старой.

Кто это придумает? Пифагор не «откроет», Ньютон не «вычислит».

Церковь сделала. Поняла. Сумела.

[Q. 1. II: 490]

Rozanov hoped that his writing would restore the lost sense of the word as spiritual comfort, of which the Church should be the guardian and refuge. In its attempts to keep a jealous monopoly on words, the Church has forgotten that it itself grew from a tradition wherein the word was open to all, where each man is free to pray or call to God, spontaneously:

Где эта религия недр человеческих, не припоминаемая из катихизма, но проходящая в жизненных содроганиях? Религия, которая не из книги, но лилась бы во всякие книги из существа человека, плодом ощущения им себя существом типично и искони религиозным?!.<sup>37</sup>

Rozanov's warnings about the loss of the living, religious word should be read in the context of the general threat he believed was posed to Russia by an unquestioning or naive adoption of Western habits and ideas. Men had been seduced by the analytic and systematizing powers of the intellect, forgetting that the purely rational use of language leads to bloodless abstractions, which provide no nourishment for thought or feeling. Rozanov realized that language was central to the control of men's minds and that the use of words had important political implications. His attack on nominalism and dogmatism in religion and society has correlations with Bakhtin's attack on monologism. It is an attack launched at the owners of meaning who insist on the unitary identity of this meaning and on its binding



power. Both writers tried to draw their readers' attention to the emptiness of the slogans on which institutions based their authority, counterposing the heterogeneous, contradictory and centripetal direction of individual speech, a sense of the radical irrepeatability and specific situatedness of the word in life and emphasizing the impossibility of final conclusions.

As described in chapter one, Rozanov and Bakhtin both describe the living word as an event, (slovo-sobytie). The awareness of the religious commandment for words to become flesh underlies both writers' work. This flesh embodies living life. When the word becomes dissociated from life, life itself is lessened, as Rozanov described in contemporary Russia:

Без-кровное и без-сочное - вот что такое наши религиозные понятия. Даже дико сказать: «понятия». Почему религия должна быть понятием, а не фактом? Книга «Бытия», а не книга «разсуждения» - так началось ветхое богословие.- «В начале-бе Слово» - так началось богословие новое. Слово и разошлось с бытием, «слово» - у духовенства, а бытие - у общества; и «слово» это безкровно, а бытие это не божественно.<sup>38</sup>

Вопреки объявлению «Слово - плоть бысть», мы разорвали «плоть» и «слово» в себе и у себя и отнесли их на противоположные полюсы. <...> Мы изнутри похолодели, залив внутри себя святой очаг Весты и на месте священных ему

жертвоприношений устроив своз нечистот. Вот узел европейской цивилизации, наших философских дефектов, и скорбей нашего дня <...>.<sup>39</sup>

Rozanov praised the Old Testament as a source of the true word as flesh: 'Ветхим Заветом я не мог насытиться: все мне казалось правдой и каким-то необыкновенно теплым, точно внутри слов и строк струится кровь, притом родная!' [O. I. I: 247] He criticized contemporary Orthodoxy for its worship of bloodless words that avoid literal reality:

Но православные неодолимо гнушаются внесением «обыкновенного» в религию <...> они, в сущности, как бы закрыли ладонью евангельское событие и сочинили на место его другое, свое собственное, чисто вербальное, словесное. <...> Православные <...> сочинили свою вербальную концепцию Вифлеема <...> и поклонились своему бесплотному рассказу вместо того, чтобы признать полное реальности воплощение Бога-Слова.<sup>40</sup>

Berdiaev also warned against the nominalism that was increasingly present in society and religion: 'Велика власть слов и в религиозной жизни. <...> «Православный» номинализм давно уже отравляет религиозную жизнь в России.'<sup>41</sup> But Berdiaev's counteracting of nominalism did not rest on so literal adherence to reality as Rozanov's. As he admitted, he had an aversion to facts of the flesh,

pregnancy and birth that Rozanov thought could counteract this nominalism.<sup>42</sup> For Rozanov, the defence of the fleshliness of the word became a defence of flesh and of feeling, as represented by childbirth, the family, love and this-worldliness against the opposite impulse to intellectual transcendence and scholastic constraint. He was contemptuous of the spiritual heroics of ascetics that he saw as an indulgence. True asceticism was not found in denial but in the respect of a thing's true value. Asceticism of the flesh was not to be attained in absolute abstinence, just as the asceticism of a valuable silence did not mean wordlessness. Rozanov saw clerical celibacy as an hypocrisy, and was outraged by the thought of the Pope's hobby being home photography, when he could not undertake the sacred domesticity of family life. This was a truly empty worldliness, unredeemed by the worldly gifts such as the sufferings and love of a family. The Church ignores the family by an almost complete lack of attention to the central facts of birth and family life, in the absence of prayers or hymns for these events:

Прольем религию в самый пол; ощущение высокого и чистого, что уже сейчас мы соединяем с религиозными отношениями, внесем это ощущение в его незагрязненности и святости в самый пульс своего бытия, <...> и мы высветимся изнутри себя, религия брызнет из крови нашей, в сочных и кровных ее чертах, взамен теперешнего религиозного номинализма и индифферентизма.<sup>43</sup>

Rozanov went further than his contemporaries in defending the literal implications of a true understanding of the word. For many the re-evaluation of the word had a religious and philosophical purpose, but nevertheless remained within the bounds of language. For Rozanov, the warm blood that he felt to be flowing within the word of the Old Testament had a clear connection with the mystery of birth, in its real, fleshly and not metaphorical significance. Rozanov argues that the facts of physical birth are intrinsically alien to the spirit of the Gospel, which is remote and other-worldly, preaching a contempt for the life of this world. He sought to return to the essential word (slovo sushchestvennoe) which comes from an engagement with life. He wanted to replace religion that is founded on words with one founded on tangible feeling. Words must embody these feelings. He believed that this was what he was attempting in his writing. As he wrote to Pertsov:

Богу угодно, чтобы словесную религиозность, глагольную религиозность и в конце концов лицемерную религиозность - многогрешный раб Божий сменил ощущаемую религиозностью, [нрзб.]. Так и делаю. «Это можно!» - может быть. Не могу не делать, ни иначе делать.<sup>44</sup>

Rozanov believed that women still carried the spark of this intuitive, internal religion of 'feeling', and that it was their task to restore this instinct to an over-

intellectualized religion and civilization:

<...> перед женщиною великая задача. Это - задача переработать нашу цивилизацию, приблизить ее к своему типу; овлажить сухие ее черты влажностью материнства <...>. На самом деле это задача не только культурная, но и религиозная: через «материнское чрево», эту таинственную «землю» бытия нашего, может пролиться религия «ощущений» взамен религии «сознания», которую одну мы имеем в своем богословском номинализме, <...>. Изнутри поднимающаяся вера; внутреннее, из «чрева» идущее, разогревание человека; возжигание вновь в нем очага Весты.<sup>45</sup>

The association of flesh, blood, warmth and the womb are continually used by Rozanov to express his sense of the nature of the word. Averintsev also describes this as a constitutive part of Old Testament tradition:

<...> ветхозаветное восприятие человека <...>; это тело не созерцаемо извне, но восчувствовано изнутри, и его образ складывается не из впечатлений глаза, а из вибраций утробы - образ страждущего и терзаемого тела, в котором, однако, живет такая кровная, чревная, сердечная теплота интимности <...>.<sup>46</sup>

Символика «теплой» и «чревной» материнской любви, столь же характерная для греко-славянской православной культуры, сколь чуждая античности, идет от Ветхого завета <...>.<sup>47</sup>

Rozanov described a link between a religious sense of the womb and the music of prayer in the Near Eastern tradition:

Семито-хамитическая Азия и была «внутреннею» частью, «задней половиною» всемирно-исторического поприща, интимною, глубокою. Там жило великое «чрево», которое истинно свято постигло задачу «плодоношения» <...> и открыло мелодию молитвы. <...> Мы - которые, забыв это, теперь уже закрытое, застаревшее, не несущее более «чрево», вынесли из него именно мелодию молитвы, «воздевание рук» к небу; и все это преобразовали в логический способ выражения, в «имя», «слова», «логос».<sup>48</sup>

Rozanov's sense of this Orthodox inheritance of the womb as the source of prayer is expressed in his opavshie list'ia, in the repeated image of himself at the breast or still in the womb. The style of writing is quite different to the rich evocations of the articles in Religiia i kul'tura: here the tone was reverent, with a frequent use of archaic language and words from the psalms and liturgy. The images in his opavshie list'ia are deliberately explicit. They are a very literal interpretation of the womb that is the enfolding, fleshly centre of religion. In the following passage, Rozanov describes himself as centred in the womb, which, as described earlier, is seen as the origin of the 'melody of prayer'; he is listening to this heavenly music: 'Я «наименее рожденный человек», как бы «еще лежу (комком) в утробе матери» <...> и «слушаю райские напевы» (вечно как

бы слышу музыку, - моя особенность).’ [Ued.: 55] The passage could be interpreted as a display of Rozanov’s literary capriciousness, to deliberately shock or surprise while seeming naive, yet it is expressive of the very same convictions that fuel his articles on Russian religion and history. The gap between the tone of these writings only proves Rozanov’s power to produce ‘many tones’ from a consistent impulse. In fact, his imagery of fleshly, maternal religion became increasingly vivid. Although he continues to defend the same values of the warmth of prayer and the flesh of the word, the style is remote from the Old Testament traditions that he recognized as his origin, as in his description of his closeness to God while feeding at the breasts of the world:

Бог охоч к миру. А мир охоч к Богу.

Вот религия и молитвы. <...>

Ах, не холодеет, не холодеет еще мир. Это - только кажется. Горячность - сущность его, любовь есть сущность его.

И смуглый цвет. И пышущие щеки. И перси мира. И тайны лона его.

И маленький Розанов, где-то запутавшийся в его персях. И вечно сосущий из них молоко. <...> И держат мои ладони упругие груди, и далеким знанием знает Главизна мира обо мне и бережет меня.

И дает меня молоко и в нем мудрость и огонь.

Потому-то я люблю Бога.

[O. 1. II: 576]

MUSIC

Rozanov used the images, cited above, of the womb and the music of prayer as sources of his words. He described his writing as inseparable from this sense of music:

Секрет писательства заключается в вечной и невольной музыке в душе. Если ее нет, человек может только «сделать из себя писателя». Но он не писатель...

.....

Что-то течет в душе. Вечно. Постоянно. Что? почему? Кто знает? - меньше всего автор.

[Ued.: 45]

Я ввел в литературу самое мелочное, мимолетное, невидимые движения души, паутинки быта. Но вообразить, что это было возможно потому, что «я захотел», никак нельзя. Сущность гораздо глубже, гораздо лучше, но и гораздо страшнее (для меня): безгранично страшно и грустно. Конечно, не бывало еще примера, и повторение его немислимо в мироздании, чтобы в тот самый миг, как слезы текут и душа разрывается, - я почувствовал безошибающим ухом слушателя, что они текут литературно, музыкально, «хоть записывай»: и ведь только потому я записывал.

[O. 1. II: 332-33]

Music was not an original image of consciousness at the time. It was widely used by symbolists and other writers of



this period throughout Europe. Belyi evoked images of musical consciousness for the new intellectual explorations of the twentieth century.<sup>49</sup> Yet characteristically, Rozanov uses the image of music as though it were his unique discovery, and to his own literary ends. Through it he emphasizes the intense subjectivity of his writing, and his closeness to God. He sees the source of religion and writing as a 'music of the soul'. This music is similar to divine possession, it is involuntary, and thus a way for Rozanov to distance himself from the responsibility of authorship and to give it a greater authority, in God:

Не всякую мысль можно записать, а только если она музыкальна.

И «У.» никто не повторит.

[Smertnoe: 158, O. 1. II: 362]

Не одни «пальцы», а еще ухо. В этом секрет. Я помню до гимназии экстатические состояния, когда я почти плакал, слыша эту откуда-то доносившуюся музыку, и которой объективно не было, она была в моей душе. С ней или, лучше сказать, в ней что-то выливалось в душу, и одновременно с тем, как ухо слышало музыку, мне хотелось произносить слова, и в слова «откуда-то» входила мысль, мысли, бесчисленный их рой, «тут» же родившийся, рождавшийся, прилетавший, умиравший или, вернее (как птицы), исчезающий в небе <...>. Это и образовало «постоянное писание», которое никаким напряжением не могло быть достигнуто.

<...>. Так вот все так вышло от Бога. И по этому качеству <...> я и считаю себя «великим писателем». Я знал свой «столб», и на этот «столб» (музыка, ухо) никто еще не встанет.<sup>50</sup>

Вообще - главное мое переутомление слуховое («вечная музыка», которую я определенно слышу).<sup>51</sup>

Rozanov uses the image of the soul as music and harmony to counteract more positivist categorizations:

Все воображают, что душа есть существо. Но почему она не есть музыка?

И ищут ее «свойства» («свойства предмета»). Но почему она не имеет только строй?

[O. 1. I: 274]

In Uedinennoe, Rozanov connects the music he hears at a concert to his own 'soul', or writing (as he equated the two). Crucial to both is the idea of flight (polet), which in this passage he refers to as 'the movement of wings':

Когда, кажется, на концерте Гофмана, я услышал впервые «Франческу да Римини», забывшись, я подумал: «Это моя душа».

То место музыки, где так ясно слышно движение крыл (изумительно!!!).

«Это моя душа! Это моя душа!»

Никогда ни в чем я не предполагал такую массу внутреннего движения, из какой собственно, сплетены мои годы, часы и дни.

Несусь как ветер, не устаю как ветер.

[Ued.: 96-97]

The musical origin of writing ensures the resistance of an artificially imposed order. The writer, Rozanov implies, is compelled to follow the movement of thought dictated by the 'music' he hears. Music was a way of overcoming the illusion of permanence that literature had asserted for itself. Music runs on unstoppably, as Rozanov describes his thoughts, and life itself running on. There is a constant loss, and yet this sense of loss stimulates newer and newer utterance.

Rozanov distinguished between writers who understood this music, in the sense of a spiritual capacity, and those who had no ear for it. Dostoevskii's writing is full of 'music of the soul', which is a pledge of its lasting importance, whereas Tolstoi's writing seeks a material permanence but does not have the spiritual strength that transcends the printed residue. The reference to the two writers is an example of Rozanov's distinction between 'construction' and 'flight' (postroiika, polet), in thought and writing, that he put forward in his footnotes to Literaturnye izgnanniki:

Каждое произведение Толстого есть здание. Что бы ни писал или даже начинал он писать <...> - он строит. <...> Уже от начала всякое его произведение есть, в сущности, до конца построенное.

<...>

Достоевский дорог человеку. Вот «дорогого»-то ничего нет в Толстом. <...> Из «убеждений» вообще ничего не выходит, кроме стоп бумаги и собирающих эту бумагу, библиотеки, магазина, газетного спора и, в полном случае, металлического памятника.

А Достоевский живет в нас. Его музыка никогда не умрет.

[Q. 1. II: 452-53]

Rozanov uses the lack of musical sense as evidence of a writer's limitations, particularly a limitation of imagination or emotion. Herzen and again Tolstoi are singled out in particular:

Чего я совершенно не умею представить себе - это чтобы он запел песню или сочинил хоть в две строчки стихотворение.

В нем совершенно не было певческого, музыкального начала. Душа его была совершенно без музыки.

И в то же время он был весь шум, гам. Но без нот, без темпов и мелодии.

Базар. Целый базар в одном человеке. Вот - Герцен. Оттого так много написал <...>

[Q. 1. II: 340]

Знаете, даже Толстой больше «мудрит», <...> нежели поет песню - т.е. то, что теперь более всего нужно миру и чего более всего миру недостает.<sup>52</sup>

Florenskii is the only writer who is accused of too constant a musicality:

Недостаток «Столпа и утверждения истины» тот, что он весь и непрерывно музыкален. Он музыкален. Но так как человек не только имеет музыку в душе, но иногда и п....., то эта сплошная добродетель в существенно религиозной книге кажется ненатуральной и «нарочно». <...>

Впрочем, Павел Флоренский особенный человек, и, м. б., это ему свойственно.<sup>53</sup>

Florenskii also described his new form of philosophical exposition in terms of a musical rhythm. He claimed that this would be truer to life than a logical structure.<sup>54</sup>

Rozanov described Dostoevskii's musical intimation of another 'harmonious' existence which he was unable to express in words: 'наш психолог отгадал меру «рая», ритм «рая», его лишь чаемую или пожалуй вспоминаемую в сновидениях «музыку»'.<sup>55</sup> He described this as a chorus that is yet to resound out of the cacophony of contemporary life:

Все подробности здесь - наше; это - мы, в своей плоти и крови, бесконечном грехе и искажении говорим в его

произведениях; и, однако, во все эти подробности вложен не наш смысл, или по крайней мере смысл, которого мы в себе не знали. Точно кто-то, взяв наши хулящие Бога языки и ничего не изменяя в них, сложил их так, так сочетал тысячи разнородных их звуков, что уже не хулу мы слышим в окончательном и общем созвучии, но хвалу Богу; и ей удивляясь, ее дичась - к ней влечемся.<sup>56</sup>

Но, я думаю, в конце концов Д-ский себя сам не понимал, <...> надо было только на шаг еще дальше продвинуться и затем «на другой ключ» перестроить все струны арфы, - и получилась бы та чудная мелодия «гармонии», которые он чувствовал как бы сквозь сон, но их въявь и пробужденно никогда не видел.<sup>57</sup>

In a letter to Turgenev, Dostoevskii had himself described music as a language of consciousness beyond the rational limits of words: 'По-моему это тот же язык, но высказывающий то, что сознание еще не одолело (не рассудочность, а все сознание) а след <овательно> приносящий положительную пользу. Наши утилитаристы этого не поймут.'<sup>58</sup> Like Dostoevskii, Rozanov saw great potential in the musical image of consciousness, which could be counterposed to the limitations of positivist views of language: 'Вот тема для великого идеального движения XX века: разработка в музыкальных тонах того, что мы разрабатываем до сих пор механизмом памяти (слова).'<sup>59</sup> Yet in an account of the phase of Russian enthusiasm for

Schopenhauer, Rozanov used the image of Russia's 'musicality' as a description of the way in which she threw herself into new ideas, but never acquired a sustained grounding: 'Вообще «камаринский мужик» (русские) постоянно с гармоньей, но только «долго» не выдерживает никакого мотива.' [Lit. izq.: 122, n.1]

Rozanov described popular songs and musical rhythms of speech as the source of vitality of Russian literature: 'Славянские же певучие говоры, заунывные тягучие песенки и весь «зимний сон» сказок предвещал литературу из чистого золота'.<sup>60</sup> He claimed that a crucial source of the Church's distancing from life was in its denial of the popular songs that were an instinctive part of worship: 'При этом общем настроении, меланхолическом и гневном к земле, замерло, как бы заморожено было на семь веков песенное и играющее творчество народа-дитяти. Нет танцев около гроба, нет песен над могилою...'<sup>61</sup> Rozanov counterposes a more native, 'playful' approach to religion to the austerities of Russia's Byzantine inheritance. He claimed that secular songs were often more responsive to man's varied spirit and answered to the joys and sorrows of the precise day or hour, the spontaneous emotion of the moment which was Rozanov's constant focus in his writing. The Church needs such spontaneity and responsiveness:

Детские песни, колыбельные песни, бытовые песни - они мотивами своими, и тонами своими и содержанием своим говорят иногда так же много, как песнопения Церквей. Но они

подвижны, живы, прилипают к сердцу человека, свежи и разнообразны, как сама жизнь: и в этом отношении они выше литургий, слишком схематичных и общих и не отвечающих человеку на скорбь этого часа, на радость этого дня.<sup>62</sup>

Yet Rozanov was still inspired by the singing of Orthodox ritual. He described his approach to religion as a musical one: 'Не на всякий час и не у каждого бывает молитва. <...> К тому же я не богомольщик-зритель, а богомольщик-музыкант; вдруг ударит тон молитвы, повышение, понижение голоса - и меня трогает до глубины.'<sup>63</sup>

Rozanov emphasized the spontaneous, musical source of prayer and all religion, as of literature. Religion, like true writing, is a musical movement 'of the soul's wings'. System and dogmatism are alien to its nature:

Религия есть молитва, Религия есть трепет крыл души, боящейся, угнетенной, тоскующей или блаженной неземным блаженством. Но религия не логика. Наконец, религия есть музыка. Со времен псалмопевца Давида религиозная настроенность души требовала созвучий арфы. А разве логика нуждается в аккомпанементе музыкальных инструментов? Из этой несовместимости уже можно видеть, что где логика, там нет религии, а где религия, там неприменима логика.<sup>64</sup>

In Temnyi lik, Rozanov blames the failure of Christianity on the fact that man failed to receive Christ in the way that he had received the Old Testament God,



whose prophetic power could transform the world by words. In Apokalipsis nashego vremeni, Rozanov is more accusatory of the Gospel itself, seeing it as primarily responsible for the scholastic and rationalizing mood of modernity. He writes that the Gospel is full of sermons, but lacks prayers, psalms and songs, the essence of religion. Christ, like Herzen and Tolstoi, is accused of lacking a musical spirit:

Много в Евангелии притчей, но где же молитва, гимн, псалом? И почему-то Христос ни разу не взял в руки арфу, свирель, цитру и ни разу не «воззвал»?

[Апок.: 627]

Какое-то странное угашение молитвенности... <...> пожалуй, тайный-то ноумен Евангелия и всего «дела евангельского» и лежал в перемене - музыки молитвы на «cogito ergo sum» богословия.

[Апок.: 629]

### SILENCE

In Rozanov's work, silence is not an absence. Rozanov makes this explicit in the opavshie list'ia genre by the frequent use not just of conventional ellipsis, but also of several rows of dots on a page, and also in the original design of the published books, where each thought, even if it was a few words, was surrounded by an entire page, to emphasize

its emergence from a silent pause. For Rozanov, and for the writers and religious thinkers whose work shows similar concerns, silence as absence of utterance is almost a substance. Rozanov believed that the central, religious concern of many of his contemporaries could not be put into words. He sees this as being a particular feature of those writers whom he called the 'literary exiles' (literaturnye izgnanniki), the unfashionably conservative, religious writers whom he believed were the unacknowledged strongholds of original thought in contemporary literary life. Rozanov describes an inexpressible sacred source of these writers' work around which writing occurs, which can only be bordered on by words, towards which words might indicate, but never give full expression. Thus he describes Strakhov's literary activity:

<...> он постоянно думает о чем-то одном: и в отношении-то к этому одному, не называя его, он и высказывает все свои мысли, чего бы ни касались оне прямым, точным значением своих слов. <...> самого же центра он никогда почти не касается словом; о чем он постоянно думает, он не говорит совсем.

[Lit. izg.: 9-10]

<...> религиозное составляет ни разу не названный центр постоянного тяготения его мысли.

[Lit. izg.: 19]

Literature is something secondary for these writers. It is even seen as a distraction from the most important work of the mind. Rozanov describes this in an article in memory of Govorukha-Otrok:

<...> вы чувствовали, <...> что между предметом текущего разговора и главным устремлением его мысли есть непреступаемая черта, что есть эта черта между предметом всех его видимых забот и центром его души, что литература, писание не только не есть для него ремесло, но и не есть даже самое священное; и что он охотно отдался бы погружению в себя, по-просту - течению своих мыслей, <...> о чем-то, что для него несравненно ценнее самой литературы и что он заденет в ней не иначе, как побочно, но так что вы почувствуете, что при этом побочна для него именно литература.

[Lit. izq.: 459-60]

<...> он был фиксирован на некоторой мысли сердца, не развивающейся, не нудящей братья за перо.

[Lit. izq.: 461]

Rozanov identifies in these writers an ambiguity towards writing itself, in contrast to the 'progressive' attitude that had an absolute faith in the power of language to reveal truth, and in the moral rightness of this activity. Rozanov instead indicates a deep unease about the very activity of writing.

Есть известие, что самый религиозный народ в истории, еврейский, никогда не произносил имени своего Бога и не писал его всеми буквами, <...>. Нечто подобное мы наблюдаем и во многих писателях. Как будто какой-то страх удерживает их говорить о том, о чем одном они хотели бы говорить, и они только подводят читателя к этому главному, но подведя - сами ничего о нем не произносят. <...> Тут есть действительно нечто целомудренное, есть резко сознание нежелание выносить словом из своей души то, что составляет самую сущность этой души и потому должно быть на веки схоронено в человеке, - должно быть цельным и нерастерянным возвращено им туда, откуда оно пришло.<sup>65</sup>

[Lit. izq.: 16]

Rozanov insists that there is a part of the soul which would be denigrated by any attempt at verbal formulation or definition. He uses the word 'chastity' to describe restraint in the use of words. Silence is a certain chasteness of spirit. He writes to Leont'ev about the centre of spiritual chastity lying in what is kept unspoken:

В одном месте, где-то Вы сказали: «самое лучшее в добром деле - это то, что оно остается неизвестно»; у Вас лучше это сказано, изящнее. Я чуть не заплакал, прочитав эти слова: в них сознан центр душевного целомудрия <...>. Мы, пишущие, вечно оскверняем этот центр.<sup>66</sup>

Rozanov describes an asceticism of silence. His use of the word 'chastity' in man's approach to words is explicitly linked to the activity of the flesh. Rozanov draws parallels between his own writing and sexual activity. He wrote in his articles on Judaism that sexual activity was a communication with God; he describes his own writing as a form of this religiously inspired sexual response, one that he found it hard to contain. Rozanov counsels an asceticism of silence, as he does an asceticism of the flesh, which he even calls 'a silence of the flesh'. However, Rozanov emphasized that asceticism should not mean enmity or hostility to the flesh but a containment that would give a greater sense of the sacred word, or flesh. In silence, we give strength to our words, as by sexual restraint we understand the power of the sexual act:

Аскетизм есть род плотского молчания, налагаемого на себя человеком не иначе, <...> как и обет молчания, <...>: углубляется внутреннее слово, когда умолкает внешнее; просветляется, озаряется сердечное глаголение, когда нет пустой базарной болтовни. Великие молчальники суть не только монастырские аскеты: ими были великие мудрецы, великие в подвиге именно слова, когда оно нужно и благовременно. Вообще все обеты молчания, плоти ли, уст ли, имеют значение великого сосредоточения, собирания человека внутрь себя. В частности, аскетизм плоти имеет то значение, что никому острота плоти и высота ее смысла не бывает так открыта, как именно аскетам <...>. Как «умное молчание» не

есть «бессловесность», презрение или отрицание существа слова, так «молчание плоти» не есть ее «искоренение», ни даже простая к ней «вражда».<sup>67</sup>

Rozanov contrasted the intensity of silent spiritual concentration with the prolixity of modern civilization, which he saw as a dissipation of the power of the word:

Средние века были великим кладохранилищем сил человеческих; в их аскетизме, в их отречении человека от себя <...>.

<...> - новая история есть антитеза средним векам. Человек не хочет и не умеет более о себе молчать: всякое малейшее чувство, всякую новую шевельнувшуюся мысль он торопится высказать другим, разрисовав ее в красках, расцветить в звуках, непременно закрепить печатным станком. Можно сказать, как сильно он таился до XIV века, так становится болтлив, переступив за грань этого века и во все последующие.<sup>68</sup>

Rozanov saw both silence and noisy talk as separate sources of civilization:

Не пишущие не могут вообразить себе той потребности «молчания», какая образуется у писателя, и оно есть одно и главное исцеление на их болезни и все. Вообще же и отдаленнее, еще вопрос, где корень цивилизации, в «молчании» или «шумной  $\alpha\gamma\omicron\rho\alpha$ ». Одно - корень, но и другое - такой же корень. <...> Кто сильнее? Мировой вообще

вопрос, что сильнее, «молчание» или «говор». <...> Вообще есть метафизика молчания, - и не решен великий спор, кто сильнее, оно или его вечное отрицание, говор, площадь, улица.

[Lit. izg.: 364, n.1]

Великая жажда уединения и молчания так же велика в человеке и вечна в нем, как потребность общения и разговор. «Монастырь» такой же столп цивилизации, как город. В городе человек рассеивается, в монастыре человек сосредоточивается.<sup>69</sup>

Rozanov's writing was rooted in the city, the noisy and fragmented existence, in the midst of voices. It expresses his immersion in the communality and conversation of the contemporary city, and yet it also answered his need for solitude, as the title of the first book of his particular genre, Uedinennoe, made clear. Rozanov claimed that writing that is seemingly scattered and impulsive can be linked by a deep concentration:

Рассеянный человек и есть сосредоточенный. Но не на ожидаемом или желаемом, а на другом и своем.

<...> Глазами, пожалуй, гляди везде: но душой никогда не смотри на многое, а на одно.

[O. I. I: 191]

Таким образом я никогда не владел своим вниманием

<...>, но напротив какое-то таинственное внимание, со своими автономными законами, <...> «владело мною».

[Lit. izg.: 256, n.1]

Writing is a continuation of conversation in solitude. It is also a necessary restoration of the spirit, through aloneness with his God, in reaction to the spiritually fragmenting effects of the modern city that he describes in his writing.<sup>70</sup> Rozanov felt the attraction of both sources of human culture powerfully. In a memoir of his student days he wrote: 'я по длинным неделям даже не спускался из своей комнатки 2-го этажа: но зато, выйдя куда,- так и разливался в смехах, остроумии и речах. И едва за дверь из гостей - опять в душе угрюмое прекрасное молчание, мое любимое молчание.'<sup>71</sup>

Despite a deep, almost nostalgic love for solitude and silence, Rozanov had an endless urge to speak and not always in intimacy.<sup>72</sup> Typically, he saw his own activity as the supreme embodiment of an endemic Russian characteristic. Rozanov recognized that speech was central to Russian culture, and that this was not always the carefully measured wisdoms of the laconic truth-seekers. Loquacity was equally characteristic of the Russian approach to the word and utterance:

Русский болтун везде болтается. «Русский болтун» еще не учитанная политиками сила. Между тем она главная в родной истории.



С ней ничего не могут поделать - и никто не может. Он начинает революции и замышляет реакцию. <...>

Русь молчалива и застенчива, и говорить почти что не умеет на этом просторе и разгуляется русский болтун.

[О. 1. I: 309-10]

The boltun's careless, endless speech is symptomatic of Russia's rootlessness, manifest verbally as well as geographically. The Russian boltun is a source of constant spontaneous speech but his ideas are contradictory, and lack coherence. Rozanov described this as a fatal characteristic of Russia, in a letter to Gollerbakh: 'Несчастливая, глупая, болтливая Россия'.<sup>73</sup> Strakhov had warned against this Russian characteristic in his letters to Rozanov: 'Я с ужасом вижу, что русские умы движутся и управляются громкими словами, сладкими чувствами, всякими соблазнами красивых и восторженных чувств и форм, но что серьезно мыслить они не способны.' [Lit. izg.: 351] In a footnote to this letter, Rozanov described Strakhov's detachment from the contemporary political prolixity, which was a dissipation of thought: 'Страхов - думал, а наша «гражданственность» всегда заключалась в этом «говореньи»: и говоруньи возненавидели мыслителя.' [Lit. izg.: 351, n.2] In a letter to the critic Griftsov, Rozanov describes the 'eloquent silence' of intelligent criticism: 'Вообще же «ум автора» (Вас) должен сказаться в полном умолчании явной, сказанной похвалы или порицания <...>. Словом, нет лучшего красноречия, чем молчание.'<sup>74</sup>

Rozanov sees the few writers still true to the spirit of Russia, such as Strakhov, as men who preserved the sense of a sacred silence. However his insistence on silence, particularly in the case of Strakhov, may be an idealization of Strakhov for the sake of Rozanov's own argument. Rozanov's analysis could be seen as the reflection of an age marked by the proliferation of print and self-declaration which was already nostalgic for the depths of spiritual concentration represented by silence. Strakhov himself writes in a spirit quite contrary to Rozanov's interpretation of him. He recognized that one could not counteract the unthinking prolixity of the radicals with silence and that it was vital to speak. He writes of the insidious effects of the silence that Rozanov claimed he held sacred in an article for Epokha in 1865: 'Молчание есть зло уже потому самому, что речь есть добро. Молчание есть мрак и смерть <...> только слово дает плоды, а молчание бесплодно.'<sup>75</sup> Suvorin also warned against the temptation to keep silent in the contemporary political situation: 'Молчать при этом обществе хуже всего, если б я молчал, было бы еще хуже.'<sup>76</sup>

Yet if silence was not a possibility for writers at the time, the discussion of silence was important for contemporary religious and philosophical debate. Silence can indicate an intense mental life. Silence and intonation can form the emotive, non-verbal background of thought. Silence and intonation, which is on the border between silence and utterance, are of extreme importance for the

views of the word expressed by Ern, Rozanov, Florenskii and Bakhtin. In 'Antinomiia iazyka', Florenskii approaches the problems of linguistic expression and silence in his discussion of the poet Fet. Music may indeed be, as it was for many writers, including Florenskii, an image for those psychological movements that defy verbal expression, but Florenskii believed, like Dostoevskii, that these would only be made truly conscious in words. As yet speech was insufficient to express the immensity of conscious life: 'В том-то и трудность, что хочется не воспеть, а именно высказать несказанное. В том-то и вопрос, что речь не может не мыслиться всецельной, всескажущей, всевыражающей.'"

Vladimir Ern distinguished between the verbal enunciation of logos and its silent, non-verbal expression, in deeds, emotions, and facial expressions. These are as much a manifestation of a writer's character (litso), as his spoken and written verbal utterances, and just as connected to the expression of logos by man:

Божественное Слово, проникая всего человека, по существу не может выразиться в том, что у человека не есть все, - т. е. в сознании. Сознание, даже творческое, гениальное, в некоторых отношениях поражено афазией, ибо тишину нельзя выразить никаким звуком и молчание нарушается словом. Но тишина не нарушается чувством и молчание сохраняется в действии. Вот почему мало знать, что написали и что сказали Гоголь, Достоевский или Соловьев, нужно знать, что они пережили и как они жили. Порывы чувства, инстинктивные

движения воли, выраставшие из несказанной глубины их молчания, нужны не для простого психологического истолкования их личности <...>, а для углубления в «логический» состав их идей.<sup>78</sup>

Words, as all living things that participate in logos, exist in potential. Representing our continual and unfinished understanding of the world, they are not a static 'given' content but emerge from what is unspoken. Ern emphasized this spiritual profundity of the hidden word that is unspoken, but which gives strength and potential to utterance. His argument has a parallel with Rozanov's emphasis on an asceticism of silence that is the source of strength for uttered words:

Для «логиста» нижний, подземный этаж личности, ее иррациональные основания, <...> полны скрытым Словом т.е. Логос'ом. Логос надземный, т. е. уже воплощенный в слове, питается непрерывно логосом подземным, т. е. еще не воплощенным; и личность, в своих вершинах достигая логоса надземного, в своих мистических основаниях погружена в те темные глубины Сущего, которые потенциально насквозь «логичны», насквозь проникнуты потенцией Логоса <...>.<sup>79</sup>

Bakhtin realized the significance of both intonation and silence as a background against which the word has value. Like Ern, Bakhtin distinguishes between silence as absence of speech (molchanie) and silence as absence of

sound (tishina). He emphasizes the value-laden and human significance of the silence that marks the absence of speech, as opposed to the silence that is mere absence of sound:

Тишина и звук. Восприятие звука (на фоне тишины). Тишина и молчание (отсутствие слова). Пауза и начало слова. Нарушение тишины звуком механистично и физиологично (как условие восприятия); нарушение же молчания словом персоналистично и осмысленно: это совсем другой мир. <...> Молчание возможно только в человеческом мире ( и только для человека). <...> Молчание - осмысленный звук (слово) - пауза составляет особую логосферу, единую и непрерывную структуру, открытую (незавершимую) целостность.<sup>80</sup>

Silence, the most intense focus of consciousness and source of all value, is frequently described by Rozanov as 'burning'. It is the molten core. Language that has hardened into valueless phrases is the cold outer crust. Rozanov always referred to the act of printing and the printed word as 'cold'. He argued that a concentrated, energetic silence would counteract the verbal dissipation that the Russian's unthinking enthusiasms lead him into: 'Чувство Родины - должно быть строго, сдержано в словах, не речисто, не болтливо, не «размахивая руками» и не выбегая вперед (чтобы показаться). Чувство Родины должно быть великим горячим молчанием.' [O. 1. II: 462]

Rozanov saw prayer as the centre of all language and so

closest to the energetic potential of 'burning' silence. Language and communication is warm in as much as it is fired by this central energy of the experience. The spontaneous, individual prayers of man, that Rozanov saw as essential to life, should be uttered against a background of silence:

Конечно лучшая молитва, горячая - в молчании. И лучше всего, удобнее приносить свою частную, личную, исключительную молитву, молитву о личном, и особенно своем, горе, раскаяние в личном и собственном своем грехе - среди полной тишины.<sup>81</sup>

Rozanov distinguished between 'warm' and 'cold' writers, according to their remoteness from the heat of intense silence that is the source of valuable words. 'Noisy' writers were also essentially 'cold':

<...> есть шумные писатели, был шумный Скабичевский, шумный Шелгунов, а уж Чернышевский просто «гремел», - и тем не менее они все были в сущности холодные писатели; как и Герцен есть блестящий и холодный писатель. Мне кажется, теплота всегда соединяется с грустью, и у Страхова есть постоянная тайная грусть; а те все были «пресчастливы собою».

[Lit. izg.: 247, n.1]

Rozanov argued that a respect for silence was a respect for

the limits of human understanding, for the most sacred, that defies words. 'Noisy' writers are ones who are impelled by a constant intellectual self-confidence, enjoying the sound of their own voices, but leaving the reader unmoved, despite all their words. The noise of the streets and the newspapers is frequently linked with coldness, just as silent concentration is described as 'fiery'. Rozanov laments the obscurity of writers like Strakhov at the expense of the success of the fashionable and 'noisy' liberals whose popularity is symptomatic of the 'coldness' in society. Strakhov does not seek applause, but understanding:

Завидования тут нисколько не входит, жажды славы как шума, <...> если бы Страхов видел, что Грот его читит не как «вообще Страхова», а ценит и понимает за определенные страницы в этой книге, за определенные мысли и тезисы его книг, <...> то вот и совершенно достаточно, без всякого шума улиц и болтовни газет. Но этого-то нет в холодной России, поистине в неодушевленной России <...>.

[Lit. izg.: 210, n.1]

While the radical inheritors of Belinskii believed that writing aimed at the progressive elucidation of the truth, the conservative tradition saw intellectual and verbal activity as only a part of man, powerless to express the whole. Rozanov described literature as an imperfect and at worst corrupting activity of which one should be wary.

He claimed to be battling against the literarization of life by focusing the attention both on the words in manuscripts and the living words of life without which written and printed words could not have true life or value.<sup>82</sup>

### INTONATION

The key to Rozanov's battle against the systematizing and literarization of life lay in the unique situation of utterance. In the opavshie list'ia genre, Rozanov emphasizes the exact physical surroundings of his words, the circumstances within which they take place, and the physical object that his words are written on. He also pays close attention to the human voice that speaks. Intonation, the tone of voice, was a vital constituent of the uniqueness of an utterance. For Rozanov the human voice was almost sacred, his first regret on hearing the news of Dostoevskii's death was that he would never hear his voice: 'И значит, живого я никогда не могу его увидеть? И не услышу, какой у него голос! А это так важно: голос решается у человека все.'<sup>83</sup> The voice was vital to the understanding of an individual:

Голос великий показатель натуры, именно - самого фундамента ее, органического, физиологического сложения.<sup>84</sup>

1 1/2 годы, оглядываясь кругом и занимаясь своей тихой



нумизматикой, но зорко вглядываясь в людей и прислушиваясь чутко к грудным интонациям голосов (внутренняя правда).<sup>85</sup>

Rozanov urged the importance of listening to the tones of voice when reading:

Есть дар слушания голосов и дар видения лиц при чтении. Ими проникаем в душу человека.

Не всякий умеет слушать человека. Иной слушает слова, понимает их связь, и связно на них отвечает. Но он не уловил «подголосков», теней звука «под голосом», - а в них-то, и притом в них одних, говорила душа.

Голос нужно слушать и в чтении. Поэтому не всякий «читающий Пушкина» имеет что-нибудь общее с Пушкиным, а лишь кто вслушивается в голос говорящего Пушкина, угадывая интонацию, какая была у живого.

[Ued.: 196-97]

He advised this technique for readers of Leont'ev: 'Если, не довольствуясь внешним смыслом им написанного, мы станем прислушиваться к тонам его речи, всматриваться в степень оживления, с какой он говорит о тех и иных предметах, <...>'.<sup>86</sup> The tone of speech can be more persuasive than argument; the priest Petrov, for example, convinced by the power of his voice: 'Тайна его успеха лежала в чарующем тембре голоса, одновременно властительного, великолепного и что-то шепчущего вот лично Вам'.<sup>87</sup> Yet speech does not always have the same power in print. This was the case with

the young philosopher Shperk and with the writer Storozhenko:

Одни и те же мысли, которые вас очаровывали в устной беседе, - будучи положены им на бумагу, становились не только мертвым, но и непонятным набором слов <...>.<sup>88</sup>

Устная речь его складывалась несравненно занимательнее, остроумнее, закругленнее, чем письменная.<sup>89</sup>

However, Rozanov himself made use of the very artificiality of print to convey as fully as possible the intimacy of speech or thought, complete with its shorthand, its unspoken intimations, and intonation. Levin emphasizes that this was a highly conscious, and literary device:

<...> пристрастие к графическому выделению (кавычками, разрядкой, курсивом) слов и словосочетаний, <...> с его помощью художник насыщает повествование настроением, глубоко личными ассоциациями, эмоциональным отношением к изображаемому; обозначенное словом явление получает неожиданное освещение, поворачивается к читателю разными своими гранями. Особенно многообразны и выразительны такие случаи у Розанова. Разумеется, это органически входит в число средств обогащения повествования звучанием, усиления интонационного движения.<sup>90</sup>

This supremely literary achievement gave a new expressive

potential to writing. Rozanov's writing, though far more conscious and 'literary' than he would have admitted, is nevertheless more natural and 'spoken' than the writing of Remizov or Belyi, the other modern and ornamentalist writers with whom Levin compares him. Rozanov had a natural ear for the texture and cadence of everyday language, both his own and others', both spoken and written. His speech, in its fragmented opavshie list'ia utterances, as well as in his conversational articles, produces the impression of a living voice, with no intrusion of a purely literary play with the sounds of words.

Rozanov saw spoken language and its emotive intonations as the source of literary vitality: '«Говор», «слово» - есть орган литературы; он орган ее - в тонах, в интонациях, в певучести, ласке, нежности. <...> «Говоры базарны и уличные» - слагают душу литературы, ее интимное, ее заветное.'<sup>91</sup> He claimed that his emphasis on indirect, intonational speech had a programmatic function:

Настала некоторая всемирная глухота к истине и в наши дни; и нет средств преодолеть ее иначе, как жгучей истиной, - истиной, которая кусала бы ухо и рвала бы человека к вниманию...

Вот почему, - конечно в идее только, - статью Свобода и вера я решил нарушить этот всеобщий риторический мир <...>. В этой и последующих статьях, «так дурно синтаксически написанных», дан полный очерк мотивов к нарушению мира; именно в интонациях, с которыми и связана

запутанность, лежит потенциально взрыв чувств, - тех именно, какие могут и должны взломать лед всеобщей условности.

[Lit. izg.: 491-92]

Rozanov sought to shake readers from their print-induced daze by the intonational confusions of his impassioned speech. He believed that these living intonations were threatened by the veneration of print as a higher authority:

Дело в том, что никакая книга не содержит в себе интонации живого голоса живого человека и не содержит «отступлений в сторону», оговорок и замечаний - которыми профессор сопровождает чтение в аудитории. Наконец, ни в какую книгу нельзя уложить и ни в какой ученой форме нельзя выразить тех частных бесед, бесед мелькающих, обрывающихся, недоконченных, которые студент <...> может иметь с профессором у него на дому или идя по коридору из аудитории. Ведь часто афоризм скажет больше, чем рассуждение; насмешка, сарказм живого человека или его восхищение, выраженное в блеске глаз и вибрации голоса, - скажут больше, чем печатные строки с печатным знаком восклицания. Словом, книга всегда «без штрихов»; и в книге говорит ученый «без тона»; а «тон делает музыку» <...>.<sup>92</sup>

In speaking about what no book can contain, Rozanov is, perhaps involuntarily, describing his own aims in writing.

Rozanov made the aside ('otstuplenie v storonu'), observations, reservations or slips of the tongue, ('ogovorki i zamechaniia') and aphorisms a literary art. He put a high value on conversation and verbal expression as he believed that it contained the life that was essential to a statement. The asides, the expressions and intonation by which a statement was accompanied were more interesting to him than the verbal 'facts'. Just as in articles on contemporary events Rozanov looked for unusual or forgotten details to yield a more profound interpretation, so he sought in the wordless background of gestures, intonations and tone of voice an indication of a truth beyond words. Mandel'shtam described Rozanov's acute sense of the intonations in conversation and phrases that keep a language shared and alive. Rozanov's image of a professor in conversation with his students is echoed in Mandel'shtam's description of Rozanov's attitude to the word:

Отлучение от языка равносильно для нас отлучению от истории. <...> русская история идет по краешку, по бережку, над обрывом, и готова каждую минуту сорваться в нигилизм, то есть в отлучение от слова.

Из современных русских писателей живее всех эту опасность почувствовал Розанов, и вся его жизнь прошла в борьбе за сохранение связи со словом, за филологическую культуру, <...>.

<...> Жизнь Розанова - смерть филологии, увядание,

усыхание словесности и ожесточенная борьба за жизнь, которая теплится в словечках и разговорчиках, в кавычках и цитатах, но в филологии и только в филологии.

Отношение Розанова к русской литературе самое что ни есть литературное. Литература явление общественное, филология - явление домашнее, кабинетное. Литература - это лекция, улица; филология - университетский семинарий, семья. Да, именно университетский семинарий, где пять человек студентов, знакомых друг с другом, называющих друг друга по имени и отчеству, слушают своего профессора, а в окно лезут ветви знакомых деревьев университетского сада. Филология - это семья, потому что всякая семья держится на интонации и на цитате, на кавычках. Самое лениво сказанное слово в семье имеет свой оттенок. И бесконечная, своеобразная, чисто филологическая словесная нюансировка составляет фон семейной жизни. Вот почему тяготение Розанова к домашности, столь мощно определившее весь уклад его литературной деятельности, я вывожу из филологической природы его души, <...>.<sup>93</sup>

The emphasis on the intonational ties within a family is not accidental. Bakhtin defines intonation as the resonance of assumed shared values that surrounds an utterance in situation. He described the intimate world of speech between friends and family as central to the life of the word in 'Problema rechevykh zhanrov':

<...> в каждом маленьком мирке семьи, друзей и знакомых,

товарищей, в котором вырастает и живет человек, всегда есть авторитетные, задающие тон высказывания, <...> произведения, на которые опираются и ссылаются, которые цитируются, которым подражают, за которыми следуют.<sup>94</sup>

Rozanov's family formed the surrounding from which his most famous genre emerged, the opavshie list'ia.<sup>95</sup> These books most of all made use of the notes and shorthand that is characteristic between close friends and family. The domestic surroundings of thoughts and conversations are duly recorded, for example: 'за чаем вспомнил', 'за уборкой библиотеки', 'через два часа, когда брела к Тане в комнату, на слова мои: «Куда ты, легла бы». 8 Ноября'. The seemingly minor events and asides of family life are written down and reflected on alongside reflections on contemporary journalism and politics, and are presented as equally serious and valuable. Rozanov sought to preserve the familiar and specific 'tones' of an individual's speech against the generalized language and conventions of contemporary journalism that was encroaching on life. Rozanov's emphatic attention to and use of intonation in literature was a conscious attempt to preserve the utterances that are rooted in a particular place, in relationship with intimates. Intonation renews the specific connections between people. This emotional accent may be humorous, ironic, affectionate or angry, but it is an essential distinction of the words used between people from the words of authority. As Mandel'shtam had written, even

the most idly spoken word has a particular resonance within a family.

Rozanov sought to convey these shared values of an intimate communication by the use of intonational devices, which though undoubtedly literary, have a similar aim to spoken intonation. He seeks to reserve the same privacy and intimacy of a spoken exchange with friends in his published literature. Only in this way, he believes, can the original warmth and life of the word be preserved. He does this in published literature as a protest against what this literature has become. In his introduction to 'V svoem uglu', his regular section in the journal Novy put', Rozanov described his aim as seeking to counteract the artifice of literary journalism with the unconstrained intimacy of private conversation:

Словом, этот отдел расширяет рамки обыкновенного журнального сотрудничества и в некоторых отношениях приближает литературу к тому безыскусственному свободному и разностороннему обмену мнений, какой составляет преимущество разговора между друзьями перед объяснением с публикой на эстраде.<sup>96</sup>

By trying to transmit in print the spoken, intonational origins of literature, Rozanov is trying to overcome the process of 'freezing-up' in the life of the word. As he wrote in 1915, the most valuable part of peoples' existence was expressed in their voice and breath:



Любовь - главное. Любовь огонь. Тепло. Все. Любовь греет.

Ведь главная задача - убежать от холода. Как же мы могли возненавидеть Россию, проклять свою родину, возненавидеть «самый состав русского человека», речь его, голос, звук, дыхание.»<sup>97</sup>

Bakhtin describes the need for shared values in a community, in order that intonation can have resonance and speech may be creatively effective, with the same image of 'warmth' repeatedly used by Rozanov: 'Известная степень тепла нужна в окружающей меня ценностной атмосфере, чтобы самосознание и самовысказывание могли осуществиться в ней, чтобы началась жизнь.'<sup>98</sup>

Bakhtin emphasizes the role of intonation in fixing the unique situation of utterance. Rozanov's writing shows the same concern with the unrepeatable, intonational situation of utterance. Yet he tried to fix these 'moments' for ever in his opavshie list'ia genre. Bakhtin places intonation itself at the edge of language, at the point where language borders on silence, as Clark and Holquist emphasize, quoting Bakhtin/Voloshinov:

Intonation, more than any other aspect of utterance, stitches its repeatable, merely linguistic stuff to the unrepeatable social situation in which it is spoken. Intonation is at the immediate interface between said and unsaid: 'it, as it were, pumps energy from a life situation

into verbal discourse - it endows everything linguistically stable with living historical momentum and uniqueness.'

<...>

The purest expression of the values assumed in any utterance is found at the level of intonation, for the reason that intonation always lies on the border between the verbal and the nonverbal <...>.<sup>99</sup>

The intonation that is the life of 'philology', that Mandel'shtam and Rozanov fought for, and Bakhtin/Voloshinov described, is essential to the life and renewal of the Russian language. Intonation is a mark of the historical irrepeatability of the moment of utterance. Thus it is of immense importance for the Russian philosophical tradition of the Word as described earlier. In terms of the Russian philosophical tradition of the Word, intonation keeps word as active flesh, as living deed answering the imperative of the moment. Life and words interact at the moment of utterance, and this interaction is guaranteed and situated by intonation. Intonation works at the limits of the expressible, but where there is a need to express. It is thus closely related to the power of silence and what cannot be known, which was discussed earlier, since it emphasizes emotive expression that cannot be reduced to words. In this sense it is very close to prayer, particularly the Hesychastic tradition where sound and rhythm are as powerful as linguistic meaning.

The physical tone of voice is important in the Near

Eastern tradition of prayer. Prayer most of all is conscious of the limitations of language, and so the physical context, vocal intonation and bodily gesture that accompany utterance are particularly important. Florenskii described the ancient link between breath and prayer. In Stolp i utverzhdenie istiny, he describes how the Hebrew word for truth produces a physical mimesis of breathing in its utterance. He emphasizes that this sense of truth as 'living' and 'breathing' is central to the specifically Russian philosophical tradition.<sup>100</sup> Losev describes the 'physiology of prayer' in the Orthodox tradition, which recognizes the sacredness of the physical body:

У отцов и подвижников православного Востока точно определены стадии молитвы: она начинается словесно, на языке, опускается в горло и грудь, сцепляется с дыханием (так что всякое дыхание есть уже молитвенный вопль), - наконец, переходит в сердце, где и собирается как ум, так и все естество человека в один горящий пламень молитвы, в одну нерасчленимую точку слияния с Богом.<sup>101</sup>

Man is reacknowledging the original Word in his attempt to offer his own words of prayer, just as in his breathing, he echoes the first breath that blew life into him. Rozanov recognized this connection between breath and God: 'самое существо, ткань, жизнебиение человека есть молитва, и в особенности из молитвы бьет бытие его. <...> самое существо человека теистично, и нельзя «дышать» и не «молиться».'<sup>102</sup>

He describes life as constant prayer, yet for Rozanov constant writing was his prayer. His life-breath and connection to God was through his writing, as Gippius put it: 'Писанье, или по его словам «выговаривание», было у него просто функцией. Организм дышет, и делает это необыкновенно хорошо, точно и постоянно. <...> Писать - самое движение души.'<sup>103</sup>

#### KNOWLEDGE AND WHAT IS NOT KNOWN

Rozanov's value for the relation between silence and words and his battle against formal system and nominalism were closely connected to his view of knowledge and understanding. The rationalist faith in language, definition and logical argument as a means to truth was underlain by the assumption that all knowledge can be expressed in words, and that man was capable of possessing and expressing truth if he acquired sufficient knowledge. Rozanov did not accept this approach. He saw understanding as a spiritual activity in which what is not known (neznanie) is a powerful source of insight. Rozanov described silence as a profound depth from which words can be spoken. What is not known is also described as a profundity from which man might utter illuminating words. The ideas and insights that stimulate Rozanov's utterances are made in reverence of the immensity of what he believes can never be known, and should not be spoken. Value must be restored to the word by treating it not as a tool of

intellectual mastery or categorization but by recognizing its sacred origin. Belyi also warned against the threat posed by systems of knowledge to the living word. He claimed that this produced a particular form of wordlessness: 'теория знания - смерть слова живого. <...> превращение слов в термины есть особая форма немoty, вместе с тем это начало восстания хаоса в нашей душе'.<sup>104</sup> This 'muteness' is distinct from the silence that is the source of what cannot be spoken. Similarly to Rozanov, Vladimir Ern drew a parallel between silence and what is not known as the source of words or knowledge. In the passage quoted earlier, he describes the 'overground' and 'underground' logos, respectively expressed in words or silent potential.<sup>105</sup> What is not known is an unspoken source that is the energetic, hot centre from which all speech, all knowing arises. Rozanov recognized this unknowing as a source of his own writing: '«Знаю» мое о ней <...> более поверхностно, чем глубина моего «не знаю». И от этих качаний, где чаша (небытия) перевешивает - и происходит все.' [Q. 1. I: 289] A degree of unknowing is the crucial dynamic of our attempts to know:

Пользуясь совершенным светом, или пребывая среди совершенной темноты, человек, быть может, не двигался бы вперед; ему нужен некоторый полумрак, и вечныя усилия разсеять его составляют то, что мы называем историей науки и философии.<sup>106</sup>

In order to restore the links and warmth between people that is the basis of a culture, Rozanov believed that it was vital to be rid of the illusion of an all-powerful intellect and to recognize the limitations of our understanding. We can know the physical surroundings of our world, the surfaces, but the essence of things remains impenetrable to us. Rozanov describes the power of birth and fertility in this way:

Кто она - «не вем». Ведь и родника электричества я не знаю. Да, и ни теплоты, ни света, никаких решительно «сущностей» мы не знаем. Мы знаем только феномены; краешек, верхушки, пустяки.<sup>107</sup>

Rozanov argues that the positivist supposition that all things are knowable is death to human life and thought. Positivist thinking means, in Rozanov's view, the imposition of a finalized definition on chance and indefinable phenomena. Like Bakhtin, Rozanov emphasizes thought and writing as a continuous process of response that defied a finalized statement. Positivism claims to be all-powerful, it does not recognize human limitation, and for Rozanov this limitation was the source of prayer, and of the emotions that bind people. These emotions are themselves religious instincts. For Rozanov, it is man's incapacity, and insufficiency before the unknown, that is the source and motive of growth in human culture. Positivism is cultural death because it no longer

recognizes these needs:

Возможно ли, чтобы позитивист заплакал?

<...>

Позитивизм - философский мавзолей над умирающим человечеством.

Не хочу! Не хочу! Презираю, ненавижу, боюсь!!!

[O. I. I: 198]

For Rozanov, not knowing was the basis not only of understanding but also of religion:

Эта странная смесь любви и незнания, молитвы с неведением, к чему она собственно прикреплена.<sup>108</sup>

И я думаю: все хорошо - что мы не понимаем; а что мы понимаем, то уже не очень хорошо.<sup>109</sup>

<...> мистически благоговеть мы можем только к тому, в чем есть место для тайны, чего мы не умеем развить и понять.<sup>110</sup>

Prayer, like understanding and language, is motivated by a sense of unknowing. In this sense writing performs a similar role to prayer, as it is a bid to overcome this unknown. Yet it is sustained by the very state of insufficiency and unknowing on which it makes its constant assays. Rozanov believed that one's own life was a constant

source of interest and utterance because it was perhaps the biggest mystery of all to us. The profundity of knowledge resists, and does not facilitate, definition:

- Кто я? Говорю о себе самом, «таком ясном предмете».  
 - Не знаю. Уж если чего я решительно не знаю, то это - кто я: и именно оттого, что слишком глубоко себя знаю.<sup>111</sup>

Я сам себя не знаю.

И ни об одном предмете не имею одного мнения.

Но сумма моих мнений, однако, есть более полная истина, чем порознь «имеемое» (кем-либо мнение).

<...> Можно ли построить формулу: «жизнь есть истина?»  
 Не смею: жизнь <...> - определения бесконечны...

С этой точки зрения жизнь и грустна, и велика. Где ее концы?

<...> бесконечные ответы... Нигде «да» и нигде «нет»...<sup>112</sup>

For Rozanov, the existence of things and the life of man must be in a constant process of utterance. Man least of all could be confined by the finalizing attempts of theory:

Человек беспределен. Самая суть его - беспредельность и выражением этого и служить метафизика.

Это - голод души. Если бы человек все «до кончика» узнал, он подошел бы к стене (ведения) и сказал: «Там что-то есть (за стеною)». <sup>113</sup>



The importance of resisting definition is central to the dynamic of Rozanov's writing. It is a justification of his seeming capriciousness and self-contradiction:

...уклончивость всех вещей от определения своего, уклончивость всех планет от «прямой»...

[O. 1. II: 498]

«Всякое определение есть сужение» (философия).

И определять не нужно.

Пусть мир будет неопределен.

Пусть он будет свободен.

.....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

Вот начало хаоса. Он так же необходим, как разум и совесть.

<...>

И вот объяснение, что душа моя путаница и как разлезающаяся нить. «Притом бумажная».<sup>114</sup>

Rozanov defied the idea that the world could be categorized and by the human intellect. His view of writing and its purpose was in absolute contrast to the critical theories of literature's purpose that dominated radical journals.

Rozanov's writing was a constant questioning of himself and God. His favourite image for this questioning was the state of the new-born infant, naked of the clothes of intellectual systems in which everyone is dressed, in a state of continual surprise. An endless surprise and curiosity was for Rozanov the greatest source of understanding.

Rozanov believed that even naming, as the start of definition, could be seen as a rupture of things that should be kept sacred, or unspoken. He claims that the simple naming of the phenomenon of death strikes him as horrific: '«Смерть» - как ужасно, что человек (вечный филолог) нашел имя для этого. Имя - уже определение, уже «что-то знаем».' [Q. 1. I: 193] Rozanov's refusal to accept man's claim to know merely because he names was a part of his battle against nominalism. Nominalism never questioned the power to name and thus to fix and define even the most elusive and awe-inspiring phenomena. The bid to avoid a final definition constitutes the motive source and sustenance of Rozanov's writing. It was a pledge of constant new birth. Rozanov makes his indecision explicit by publishing his internal debate. The frequent use of qualifying hesitancies such as 'может быть', 'кажется', 'не от этого-ли?', bears witness to this questioning, reminding the reader that he will not receive any ready answers. Rozanov makes it clear that this uncertainty is itself a world-view:

Истина заключается именно в неокончательном, в нетвердом, в неуверенном. Как уверенность - так ложь! Да что-же: разве нет в мире кроме цветов - и оттенков, кроме прямых линий - изогнутых, «неуловимых», кроме «да» и «нет» еще «что-то», «кажется» и пр.. Сам мир полон нерешительностей и уже с этим ничего не поделаешь. Да, скажу более: как только мир весь и без остатка перешел бы в «ясные очевидности», так он сделался бы конечным, ограниченным, немножко глуповатым весь - конечно безсильным. И попросту перестал бы «родить» и потерял бы «будущее». <sup>115</sup>

A value for profundity of silence does not mean a denial of speech. Nor does the recognition of the greater depth of unknowing than what is known make the attempt to make sense futile. For Rozanov speech and the attempt at understanding are a simultaneous, constant activity, carried out on the basis of an immense unknown. Bakhtin linked the importance of a constant reinterpretation of meaning that resists a finalizing last word to the whole of consciousness and the human character (lichnost'). This approach to knowledge is contrasted to the impersonal systematizing of scientific knowledge, showing Bakhtin's closeness to other thinkers in the Russian logos tradition:

СМЫСЛ потенциально бесконечен, <...>. Не может быть единого (одного) СМЫСЛА. Поэтому не может быть ни первого, ни последнего СМЫСЛА, он всегда между СМЫСЛАМИ, звено в СМЫСЛОВОЙ ЦЕПИ <...>. В исторической жизни эта цепь растёт

бесконечно, и потому отдельное звено ее снова и снова обновляется, как бы рождается заново.

Безличная система наук (и вообще знания) и органическое целое сознания (или личности).<sup>116</sup>

Bakhtin claimed that a passionate individual engagement was necessary to avoid the schematizing and thus impoverishment of existence: 'только любовно заинтересованное внимание может развить достаточно напряженную силу, чтобы охватить и удержать конкретное многообразие бытия, не обеднив и не схематизировав его'.<sup>117</sup> Gershenzon expressed a similar criticism of the impoverishing effect of rational definitions in a letter to Rozanov: 'чем человек мне равнодушнее, тем легче мы сбиваемся на расценку (рассудочную) его отдельных черт.'<sup>118</sup>

Rozanov's thought demonstrates precisely such a passionate individual engagement, and its specificity and attention to detail is the source of its endurance. Even the writings of fellow religious thinkers such as Ern, Berdiaev and Losev are characterized by the use of abstract and generalizing definitions that verged on the formulaic. These were alien to Rozanov, whose lasting strength is in his concrete examples from life, his belief in the significance of the slightest details and his distrust of mere words.

LIK, LITSO, AND LICHNOST'

Rozanov's emphasis on the sacred sense of the individual, the litso, in history was central to his criticism of contemporary writers. As he wrote in his first, most famous work of criticism, Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore: 'только в религии открывается значение человеческой личности. <...> личность всякая, которая жива, абсолютна как образ Божий и неприкосновенна.'<sup>119</sup> Rozanov avoided general theories and focuses on revealing details of personality that would have been condemned by the positivist schools of literary criticism as irrelevant subjectivism. He also claimed that the individual's immediate experience was far more important than theory:

Слушайте, человек: что для нас самое убедительное? Нечто, что мы сами увидели, узнали, ущупали, унюхали. Ну, словом: знаю, и баста. <...> Всякий человек живет немногими знаниями, которые суть плод его жизни, именно его, опыта, страдания, нюха, и зрения.

[Smert.: 151]

In his introduction to the 'Niva' edition of Dostoevskii's collected works, Rozanov emphasizes that this unrepeatable individual experience is the only true motivation for writing and for reading: 'В индивидуальном - основание истории, ее главный центр, ее смысл, ее значительность: ведь человек, в противоположность животному, всегда лицо,

ни с кем не сливаемое, никого не повторяющее собой.'<sup>120</sup>

Rozanov recognized that despite what was claimed in theory, sympathies and antipathies towards individuals were extremely powerful in deciding one's allegiances to institutions, parties, schools of thought and ideas: 'обернувшись на истории своих убеждений, твердейшие из нас, быть может, найдут, что это есть собственно история человеческих привязанностей, привязанностей к человеку, к лицам, и уже за ними к концепциям философским и религиозным'.<sup>121</sup> Indeed he argued the supremacy of a writer's physical presence over his writing: 'in concreto человек всегда интереснее и лучше еще, чем по писаниям, письмам. Сужу по Страхову, которого долго знал, и из знания этого извлек бездну наслаждения, пользы'.<sup>122</sup>

A way of life, thought, habits and mannerisms all receive their expression in a writer's character, his litso, that is manifest in his facial expression, his movements, appearance and surroundings, even when he tries to conceal them in his prose. These details can reveal more than even private letters or diaries and Rozanov placed great importance on them. He always asked for photographs of the writers with whom he was in correspondence. He also paid attention to the physical surroundings of writers, their rooms and furnishings, their clothes, even their way of walking. Physical gestures were for Rozanov an extension of spirit, like handwriting. Printed words can conceal and deceive, but these physical details and surroundings bear witness to the life itself and the spirit in which it is

lived. Losev describes the metaphysical importance of these physical details in Dialektika mifa:

По телу мы только и можем судить о личности <...>. Тело - живой лик души. По манере говорить, по взгляду глаз, по складам на лбу, по держанию рук и ног, по цвету кожи, по голосу, по форме ушей, не говоря уже о целых поступках, я всегда могу узнать, что за личность передо мною. <...> живое тело <...> есть и остается единственной формой актуального проявления духа в окружающих нас условиях. Однажды я сам заметил, что у меня изменилась походка; и, поразмысливши, я понял, отчего это случилось. Тело - неотъемлемая стихия личности, ибо сама личность есть не больше как телесная осуществленность интеллигенции и интеллигентного символа. Мне иной раз страшно бывает взглянуть на лицо нового человека и жутко бывает всматриваться в его почерк: его судьба, прошлая и будущая, встает совершенно неумолимо и неизбежно.<sup>123</sup>

For Losev as for Rozanov, a person's voice or handwriting could constitute a stern philosophical truth. Like Rozanov, who claimed of himself that he had a most repellent way of walking, Losev observes his own way of walking and finds in it a comment on his more general fate. Rozanov's sharpest insights are often contained in his reflections on these seemingly 'subjective' observations of the details of people's physical presence, their way of speaking, as well as silent forms of self-expression, which could often

reveal the essence of an individual's nature. Physical presence was an important criterion of character for Rozanov. He confessed an antipathy to fat writers, which provoked in him an hostility out of proportion to the impact of their writing.<sup>124</sup> Yet the most humbling physical actions, scratching, sneezing or peeing, are all indicators for Rozanov of a necessary humanity. He claimed that the fact that he could not imagine Merezhkovskii performing these human actions was proof of his 'unreality'. For Rozanov, both Solov'ev and Merezhkovskii lack a physical presence which is linked to his distrust of their ideas.<sup>125</sup> In an article on Dostoevskii, Rozanov focuses on his use of scratching oneself (pochesyvanie) as an image of why man's psychology would always defy the restrictions of rational system.<sup>126</sup> Rozanov emphasized the importance of the physical face for revealing the secrets of a man's nature that are not revealed in words:

Лица Тютчева, Тургенева, Островского не только выразительны и полны мыслью, но они как бы договаривают вам недоговоренное в «полном собрании сочинений». <...>  
 <...> Вообще, кто любит человека, не может не любить лица человеческого, «лицо» у себя под старость мы «выслуживаем», как солдаты - «георгия». В лице - вся правда жизни; замечательно, что нельзя «сделать» у себя лицо, и если вы очень будете усиливаться перед зеркалом, «простодушное» человечество все-таки определит вас подлецом. Лицо есть правда жизненного труда именно в скрытой, а не явной его



части <...> Сумма мотивов, замыслов; не одного осуществленного, но и брошенного в корзину.<sup>127</sup>

Ern similarly asserted the importance of what could not be said in words, but was expressed in actions and in the irrefutable evidence of one's face: 'Логос <...> требует существенного внимания не только к мысли, звучащей в словах, но и к молчаливой мысли поступков, движений сердца, к скрытой мысли, тающейся в сложном, подвижном рисунке индивидуального лица.'<sup>128</sup>

Rozanov believed that man approaches God through fellow individuals. He claimed that one could accept the entirety of a religion for the sake of one inspiring face. Thus the Church is sustained not by dogma but by individuals, in whose faces we can 'read' the image or Word of God:

Эта, казалось бы, странная вера - есть, в сущности, очень живая и глубокая: мы доходим до Бога через человека; за человеком, <...> за смирением и красотой человеческой. «Вместе» идем к Богу - так выходит; и, может быть, сущность церкви основывается не на догматической солидарности, но на этом как бы чтении лика Божия, отраженного в лице человеческом, «в брате моем», «чистейшем, нежели я». <...> Да ведь и в самом деле церковь - не *summa regulorum*, а море лиц и совестей <...>.<sup>129</sup>

However, Rozanov also claimed that a face would be equally

able to make him a revolutionary as a churchgoer. Thus he embodied the Russian tradition of valuing character over system in the extreme: '«Симпатичное лицо» могло увлечь меня в революцию, могло увлечь и в Церковь, - и я в сущности шел всегда к людям и за людьми, а не к «системе и за системой убеждений».' [Lit. izg.: 257, n.1] Yet the loss of an individual litso was evident in the church, in intellectual life, and most lamentably, in women, whom Rozanov sees as the source of the most sacred values in Russian life. He identifies the loss of expression in women's faces as emblematic of a more fundamental malaise in society:

<...> упадок женской красоты и даже какой-нибудь определенной выразительности женских лиц так глубок и всеобщ <...>. Женщина (и девушка) - стерлась <...>. Это так глубоко, до того странно <...> и оплакиваемое здесь - не женщина только, но вся наша цивилизация. Ибо какова женщина, такова есть или очень скоро станет вся культура.<sup>130</sup>

Rozanov warned that sacred individual character was being replaced by a new and faceless individualism, evident in people and institutions as in the 'faceless' process of historical theories. This individualism ignores the fundamental truth of existence, which lies in a true engagement and response to others. In their isolation from each other, men have become similarly banal: 'Индивидуализм

НОВЫХ обществ, индивидуализм не в смысле яркости человеческой личности (скорее она тускла теперь), но в смысле ее разобщенности, оторванности от какого-либо целого <...> - вот что не переносится человеком в силу также неуничтожимых сторон его души.'<sup>131</sup> Rozanov was not alone in this recognition. Zinaida Gippius wrote of true individuality as a connection to society: 'Действительное сознание «личности» не уничтожает сознание «человечества». Чем глубже познается различность, тем ярче ощущается единство, общность.'<sup>132</sup> She too claimed that people were becoming collectively duller. Rozanov saw the loss of individual character as symptomatic of a more widespread loss: 'Линяет, линяет человек. Да и весь мир в вечном полинянии.' [O. 1. I: 297] Writers are also losing their individual character. This is fatal for literature:

Но что же это за ужасы, что писатели боятся иметь свое лицо. Ибо ведь «зачем же я пишу», как не чтобы «сказать лицо свое», сказать «от лица своего».

Погасить лицо значит погасить литературу.

Таким обр. литература внутренне погашается...<sup>133</sup>

Rozanov claimed that the individual character of Russian institutions was also threatened by uniformity: 'Нужно было вернуть «лицо» всем этим угнетенным началам русской истории - лицо, достоинство, деятельность.' [O. 1. II: 528] The restoration of this litso was a task for Russia as a nation. Russia needed to become conscious of

her own distinct role. She needed to show her face to other nations, which would be not the false face of borrowed foreign forms, but her individual character, that is the expression of her divine Lik:

Но пока, в этот век и ближайшие, на чреду позваны именно мы; нам указано быть, перед Богом, и перед другими народами, лицом, исповедующим истину своего бытия, раскрывающим эту истину в сложных идеях, в далеких чаяниях, в углублениях своего сердца.<sup>134</sup>

In a footnote in Literaturnye izgnanniki, Rozanov connects his realization of the intimate link between the face, other people and God to an incident from his own life. When he was teaching in the primary school in Elets, he was slapped in the face in a dispute with the parent of a pupil. Rozanov suffered extreme spiritual trauma from this event, which, he confessed, drove him close to suicide, although 'nothing in particular had happened'. He explains the extremity of his reaction by the close connection of the face to God. It is as though the assault severs this connection:

Я думаю, есть нечто метафизическое и особенное в «строении лица», вот «лицевых костей», в «благородной коже» вот именно лица (и только его) <...>. «Устами» мы говорим. Вдруг этим «говорящим устам» наносится удар <...>. И «уста» умолкают, «божественное лицо» в человеке разбито. <...>

Вообще, пусть навсегда читатели поймут, что есть что-то страшное и тайное в лице человека, которое ни снимать с индивидуума, ни разбивать его, портить, - ни вообще, наконец, прикасаться к нему иначе как поцелуем и ласкою не должен никакой смертный.

[Lit. izq.: 278-79, n.1]

Rozanov experienced the slap in the face, not as a physical, but as a metaphysical affront. In the Russian tradition this physical face, litso, is the fullest physical and spiritual manifestation of our human character, it is our embodiment of the divine Lik. The face is our spiritual connection to other men, as the source of our words and emotional expression through which we communicate to others and also make reply to God. A slap in the face is an assault on this most sacred connection.

Rozanov's strong sense of solitude and isolation from human contact, at times overwhelming, perhaps gave vehemence to his assertions that consciousness is dependent on others. It is the root of his continued assertion of the need for connection or union, (sviazannost', sliiannost'). Rozanov maintained that his own individuality, and its written expression, was dependent on his connection to another. This was his common-law wife, Varvara Butiagina, referred to in Opavshie list'ia as his beloved friend, 'drug' :

Если бы не любовь «друга» и вся история этой любви, -

как обеднилась бы моя жизнь и личность. Все было бы пустой идеологией интеллигента. <...>

Судьба с «другом» открыла мне бесконечность тем, и все запылало личным интересом.

[Q. 1. I: 169]

Самый смысл мой осмыслился через «друга». Все вочеловечилось. Я получил речь, полет, силу. Все наполнилось «земным» и вместе каким небесным.

[Q. 1. I: 284]

The meeting point of one's own and another consciousness was for Rozanov the most extreme point of individual existence:

<...> вступая в брачную, то есть глубочайшую, связь с человеком и человечеством, каждый из нас подходит к краю индивидуального бытия своего, он стоит на берегу неисследимых оснований личного своего существования, понять которых никогда не может и только инстинктивно, содрогаясь и благоговая, ищет освятить их в религии.<sup>135</sup>

Rozanov maintained that his early sense of solitude and separateness was a source of his need to write, to overcome both the physical and spiritual wall of his isolation. However, it was only through his connection with Butiagina and her family that his words could gain strength. The sense of the other does not eliminate

solitude, but deepens it, making it productive and allowing words to be written, not without hope of a receiving consciousness.

This need for a receiving other and the role of the other in the development of our consciousness is central to the work of Bakhtin: 'Слово, живое слово, неразрывно связанное с диалогическим общением, по природе своей хочет быть услышанным и отвеченным.'<sup>136</sup> Bakhtin reiterates this theme in his late notes: 'История конкретного самосознания и роль в ней другого (любящего). Отражение себя в другом.'<sup>137</sup> For Bakhtin, the point of meeting between two individual existences, at which words are spoken, is crucial to an understanding of words in speech and in writing and in human life: 'Диалогическое отношение как единственная форма отношения к человеку-личности, сохраняющая его свободу и незавершенность.'<sup>138</sup> Bratchenko emphasizes that in Bakhtin's view, the individual lichnost' is most fully alive in its verbal encounter with the world of others: 'Личность и существует прежде всего на границе («на пороге») своих отношений (реальных или мыслимых) с миром. Это всегда будут именно ее отношения, отношения конкретной личности'.<sup>139</sup> Bratchenko also emphasizes that for Bakhtin, true dialogue means that words cannot be reduced to a mere 'object' of study, but demand an active response: 'личность как таковая не может быть «объектом изучения», она может стать лишь «субъектом обращения», для которого другой - не «он» и не «я», а полноценное «ты», то есть другое чужое полноправное «я»...'<sup>140</sup> Bakhtin's

insistence that the individuality of people and utterances is not reduced to an abstract formulation in the interest of theory is very close to Rozanov's own refusal of such a rationalized reduction; Rozanov, like Bakhtin, demands that man's individuality be approached only in a spirit of openness:

Человек вовсе не хочет быть только средство, он не вечный учитель в словах своих <...>. Он просто свободный человек, со своей скорбью и со всеми радостями, с особенными мыслями <...>. Оставьте его одного, с собой, он вовсе не материал для теорий. Он живая личность, «богоподобный человек». Умейте подходить к нему с любовью и интересом, и он раскрывает перед вами такие тайны души своей, о которых вы и не догадываетесь.<sup>141</sup>

#### GROWTH, POTENTIAL AND CONNECTION

For Rozanov, the word 'potentiality' (potentsial'nost') had important implications, linked to his ideas on understanding as an inner perception as opposed to the intellectual mastery of knowledge. This was a central principle of his early philosophical work O ponimani<sup>142</sup> Rozanov believed that things, ideas and people had a potential existence far beyond what man sought to measure in his immediate world. Gollerbakh wrote that Rozanov intended to follow his book O ponimani with a work called 'O potentsial'nosti i roli ee v mire fizicheskom i



chelovecheskom'.<sup>143</sup> He explains the sources of his thought in a letter of 1918 to Gollerbakh: 'Слово - одно: потенция («зерно») - реализуется. <...> Религия, «царство» (устройство России) - все здесь, в идее «потенция», «что растет».'<sup>144</sup> Rozanov emphasized the importance of the concept in a letter to Leont'ev guiding his reading of O ponimanii: 'обратите внимание на понятие потенциальности, этого странного полу-существования, которое есть в мире, действительно, - и Вы будете на пути к полному усвоению моего взгляда на человека, его природу, его душу, его цель'.<sup>145</sup> Rozanov's characteristically ambitious formulation, 'potentiality', was for him a key discovery that would transform the existing structures of knowledge.<sup>146</sup> He explains this original impulse, that lay behind his first book O ponimanii, in Mimoletnoe:

- Я вам дам Universitas litterarum... план не только сущих, но и всех будущих, самой возможности науки, всех возможных наук <...>...

ИЗ ЗЕРНА - ДЕРЕВО - вот мой единый учитель, единая книга...

<...>

- Ум растет...

- Все растет...

- Все вечно и живо...

И - применил к науке. Вот мой «метод». Хорошо. И нельзя в Розанове ничего понять, не простудировав (с 1/2 года) «О понимании»...<sup>147</sup>

Rozanov's value for the seed or kernel of thought was expressed in his first collection of aphorisms, 'Embriony', published in Religiia i kul'tura. Ironically, in its later development, these scattered thoughts are called opavshie list'ia, emphasizing the moment of death not of birth. Yet the idea of the seed, or root, which is the concentrated potential of future growth, remained important for Rozanov. Rozanov saw the roots as a source of insight about the potential growth of each living person, institution or culture: 'В самом деле, нужно же относить всякую вещь к ее органическому источнику, началу; и именовать ее по имени этого источника, а не как-нибудь иначе и не случайно'.<sup>148</sup> He used this method in his own self-description: ' Жизнь наша течет из корня нашего рождения... Этот «корень» у меня был крайне смутный, хаотический и воспламененный.' [Lit. izg.: 141 n.1]

The idea of potential emphasizes that the world, and our perception of it, is in a continual process of growth and change, in which we participate by our attempts at knowledge. This is also the source of Rozanov's own writing. In 'Embriony' he argued that a crucial part of his ideas on potential was engagement with the life of other things: 'всякая вещь есть часть бесчисленных других вещей, их эмбрион, потенция их образования - и поэтому только она входит в соотношение с этими другими вещами, связывается с ними, а от других, наоборот, отталкивается.'<sup>149</sup> Rozanov criticized socialism as symptomatic of a sense of disconnection experienced between people, and from

contemporary reality:

<...> в наши годы, в этих новых обстоятельствах, каждый человек остается, как и всегда, живым ростком, органы которого тяготеют к почве, к атмосфере, свету солнца. <...> он выпускает корни, которые напрасно ищут укрепиться в зыбкой, текущей под ним действительности, выкидывает листки, которым навстречу не бегут никакие живительные, греющие лучи. Так называемое «искание» - неопределенное, мучительное, в котором все инстинкты человеческие извращены, является последствием этого отношения человека к действительности.<sup>150</sup>

Социалист - <...> обычно безроден; это - скиталец <...>. Он - человек, который потерял свое место в мире и собственно потерял всякое взаимодействие с ним <...> в нем он блуждает, и блуждая, разрушает, потому что ни к чему не тяготеет, не может тяготеть.<sup>151</sup>

Lacking contact with real life, Rozanov believed that people turned to socialism's illusory visions of human connection for comfort. He emphasized the importance of responding to people's early impulses, before the intensity of their search was quelled by dogmatic systems: 'Всякая вещь in statu nascente особенно восприимчива к влияниям. Пропустите этот счастливый момент, когда она уверена в себе - и на завтра вы уже ничего не сделаете с ее застывшими и до некоторой степени самодовольными формами.'<sup>152</sup> Не

emphasized the need to find responsive new forms in literature, thought and social organization in order to respond to human impulses and keep them warm.

Rozanov saw his writing as a bid to find connection with the world and life of 'things' that he believed was crucial for existence. Mochul'skii recognized this as an essential need in Rozanov's writing: 'оторванность влечет Розанова к страстной жажде человеческой связанности, слиянности, соединенности'.<sup>153</sup> Rozanov expresses a recurrent fear of the emptiness, cold and the isolation of people that he sees as engulfing society. His descriptions of Ancient Egyptian or Judaic society are marked by a nostalgia for an idealized human interconnection that he claimed they represented. In Rozanov's view, these cultures had a stronger sense of their own existence, and of the reality of the visible world around them. Their mutual needs were more purely expressed: 'Было питание взаимное каждым существом всех и всеми существами каждого, - <...>. Все всем было родное; все во всех было единое.' [Lit. izg.: 249, n.2] In the book Semeinyi vopros v Rossii, Rozanov juxtaposed the text of the dream in Dostoevskii's Son smeshnogo cheloveka with the Egyptian drawings that he had traced in the Rumiantsev museum.<sup>154</sup> He felt that the golden age existence described in Dostoevskii's story was perfectly evoked in the Egyptian drawings, where figures are shown in stances of mutual protection, watchfulness and grace.

In the subject and form of his writing, Rozanov was

seeking to restore this lost connection. He believed that a sense of need and insufficiency should cause men to speak to one another and their self-confessions are almost like prayers, binding them to their world and to one another. He wanted this need and dependence of people on one another and on God. He detested the rationalist view that seeks to define each individual and his rights in isolation. God represents the impossibility of absolute independence, man's insufficiency to himself alone. Rozanov even argued that God exists as man's need, ('что мне нужно'). The presence of God as an unseen absolute to whom one can speak allows the world and individuals to be 'in connection':

Только от Бога и через Бога все связуется и все осмысливается <...>. В смерти самой идеи Бога (только идеи) - умирает мир. Нет Бога - умер мир; есть Бог - мир осветился, согрелся, образовался, <...> все есть «что мне нужно». «Что мне нужно» и «что миру нужно» в высшей степени связуется с «Бог есть». Связуется и - зависит.<sup>155</sup>

In the Russian Orthodox tradition, and in Rozanov's own writing, there is much emphasis on the wholeness and unity of creation, which is nevertheless not susceptible to rational analysis. Connections in this world are not guaranteed by intellectual classification but depend on prayer to preserve the sense of unity. Rozanov could thus see his exclusive isolation with God as a way of participating in a greater unity and achieving connection

from within his solitude. The emphasis on prayer as achieving connection in a world that has been fragmented and ossified by a destructive analytical rationalism is an important theme of Rozanov's writing:

Где же однако, хоть приблизительно, этот «выход» из рационализма <...> ? В бесконечностях религии. Мир создан не только «рационально», но и «священно», столько-же «по-Аристотелю» как «по-Библии», столько-же «для науки», как и «для молитв». <...> В центре всего лежит молитва и любовь. Так весь мир, - этих животных, этих растений, - согревается и связывается тоже любовью и нам непостижимой верой. Частицу этой «веры» (религии, молитвы) мы находим даже в том, что «растения не растут дерево к дереву» <...>. В мире проглядывает лицо человеческое, даже Лицо Человеческое <...>. И мы не только умом постигаем мир, но и трепещем сердцем к миру. Тут брежится вдали Египет <...>.

[Lit. izg.: 248-49, n.1]

In Rozanov's view, the world cannot be defined into separate categories, but is in a constant process of self-definition. This is carried out by each man from his individual viewpoint, who acts as a completing, receiving eye to the 'unfinished' existence of the things he perceives around him. Man tries to understand his own changing thoughts and reactions to the world before God, who is his completing watcher. He confesses his most intimate thoughts to other men and so participates in the

ancient process of mutual emotional and spiritual 'feeding', that is for Rozanov so close to prayer. This sense of a world, in a constant and unending process of definition, dependent on many different mutually complementary viewpoints, answering to one another and completing each other, infused overall by an overwhelming need for prayer, is again very close to Bakhtin's description of the world, particularly in Avtor i geroi v esteticheskoi deiatel'nosti and in the notes of 1970-1971. Bakhtin likewise emphasized the vital relation between man and his world as a mutual witnessing and evaluation:

Свидетель и судия. С появлением сознания в мире (в бытии), а может быть, и с появлением биологической жизни (может быть, не только звери, но и деревья и трава свидетельствуют и судят) мир (бытие) радикально меняется <...>. Оно перестало просто быть, а стало быть в себе и для себя (эти категории появились здесь впервые) и для другого, потому что оно отразилось в сознании другого (свидетеля и судии): этим оно в корне изменилось, обогатилось, преобразилось.<sup>156</sup>

Rozanov criticized contemporary poetry for having lost this sense of the subject's relationship to the world, in which the world itself participates, at least implicitly, in the act of utterance. He uses a similar image of witness and judge to describe this interdependence:

Мир, как предмет любви и интереса, даже как предмет

негодования или презрения, - исчез из этой «поэзии»; он исчез не только как объект, возбуждающий к себе что-нибудь у бессодержательного я, но и как зритель и возможный судья этого я, как просто присутствующий <...>.<sup>157</sup>

This view of the world was, however, remote from the prevalent scientific, categorizing approach that sought to establish fixed laws of human behaviour. Rozanov and a few unfashionable contemporaries held out for the value of that which resists definition.



CHAPTER III: INTIMATE GENRES AND THE READERTHE READER

Rozanov's writing, despite its claim to be 'writing for oneself', in isolation, is far more engaged with the reader than is at first admitted. The questioning of the relationship a writer has with his readers in the process of writing, the effect of his work on readers, and the analysis of contemporary readerly expectations was an important part of Rozanov's writing. While claiming a purity of relation to himself in his writing, denying the presence of a reader, he engages in an intimate address, and not only interjects anticipated reactions from an invented reader within his text, but also states his ideal aims for the reader's soul that should be achieved by his writing.

In a letter to the editors of Russkoe obozrenie in 1896, Rozanov makes an early statement of his view of writerly responsibility. While defending the private nature of the writer's search for truth, Rozanov recognized that his responsibility to the reader begins with the moment of utterance. The picking up of his pen is a symbol of outwardness, and thus of answerability to a receiving consciousness, the reader. He is responsible to convey effectively to others what he uncovers before God:

К читателю, то-есть как писатель, человек этой одной

стороной и открыт: самое содержание идей, истинность или неправильность их есть отношение его к себе самому, к дарам своим, к силам; к природе своей нерукотворенной, я хочу сказать - к Богу. <...> обязанность его перед читателем, его свобода, ответственность, начинается с того момента, как он берется за перо; т. е. она относится к сфере манеры, способа изложения, к тому, что называется «языком», «слогом», «мелочами».<sup>1</sup>

Rozanov argued that writers must rethink their responsibility to their readers. Writing demands profound self-immersion if it is to be of any help in people's lives:

Нужно понять эту задачу во всей ее строгости, нужно отнестись к ней с той же простотой и серьезностью, с какой относится к ней каждый в глубине своей души, наедине с собой. Для литературы - это задача неизмеримо-трудная. Заинтересоваться единственно предметом своим и относиться к читателю так же правдиво, как к самому себе - это может быть доступно только высоким душам.

[Lit. izg.: 63]

Dostoevskii had spoken of this task of communicating the results of an intense self-engagement in a literary form in Dnevnik pisatel'ia:

Но буду я говорить сам с собой и для собственного

удовольствия, в форме этого дневника, а там что бы ни вышло. <...> Если же найду читателя и боже сохрани, оппонента, то понимаю, что надо уметь разговаривать, и знать, с кем и как говорить. Этому постараюсь выучить, потому что у нас это всего труднее - то есть в литературе.<sup>2</sup>

Rozanov recognized the ambiguity of this simultaneous rejection and appeal to one's readers in Dostoevskii's Dnevnik pisatel'ia: 'Он кончил «Дневником Писателя», субъективнейшей формой беседы ли с собой или, как в данном случае, обращения к окружающим.'<sup>3</sup> He claimed that the writer must engage the reader with the same integrity that he questions himself. A sense of an implied reader is thus inherent in the structure and style of the utterance. Bakhtin emphasized that the conception a writer has of his reader is crucial to an assesment of his style:

Вопрос о концепции адресата речи (как ощущает и представляет его себе говорящий или пишущий) имеет громадное значение в истории литературы. Для каждой эпохи, для каждого литературного направления и литературно-художественного стиля, для каждого литературного жанра в пределах эпохи и направления характерны свои особые концепции адресата литературного произведения, особое ощущение и понимание своего читателя, слушателя, публики, народа. Историческое изучение изменений этих концепций - задача интересная и важная.<sup>4</sup>

Кому адресовано высказывание, как говорящий (или пишущий) ощущает и представляет себе своих адресатов, какова сила их влияния на высказывание - от этого зависит и композиция и в особенности стиль высказывания.<sup>5</sup>

The style and tone of speech take into account the presumed evaluative context of the addressee, yet they also have a more active function. The words chosen by the author of the utterance are themselves an anticipation of the given cultural sphere in which the author is talking, the addressee's views, sympathies and preconceptions. On all of these the author is acting by the very choice of his words.

Rozanov's attitude to the reader is problematic. At times it seems as though his work shows an intense preoccupation with the reader. He frequently addresses the reader directly, often intimately. Rozanov shows a constant awareness of the reader by actually introducing the reader as a speaker, and equal in dialogue, only Rozanov has written his words. Yet despite this intensified concentration on the role of the reader, situated within the actual writing process, Rozanov claims an inviolability from the traditional readerly expectations. He begins Uedinennoe with a formal casting off of the reader, which treats the reader as an intimate, while rejecting his presence:

Ах, добрый читатель, я уже давно пишу «без читателя», - просто потому что нравится. Как «без читателя » и издаю...

[Ued.: 36]

Rozanov makes a formal rejection of his reader in order to create the state of solitude, or aloneness with God, in which he can discover the themes that he really wants to speak about, that constitute the motive force of his work. As discussed in the first chapter, he distances himself from the contemporary literary audience in order to draw closer to the truth of himself. Yet he claims that in this way he also draws closer to the essential, spiritual needs of his readers. He writes of the danger of writing as leading to a vanity, a posturing before the literary public and therefore a falsification of one's self-understanding, a task that should be undertaken alone, before God. The reading audience can threaten to diminish, not increase, one's responsibility towards truth. Rozanov wrote that there were some subjects that even Strakhov thought were too sacred to be made public before the readerly mass. He explains Strakhov's laconicism on these matters as a protection against the profanation or miscomprehension of his ideas by the crowd:<sup>6</sup>

<....> тут есть нежелание обнаружить самые заветные, быть может, из своих убеждений перед толпой, каковою, в конце концов, не могут не представляться каждому автору его читатели. Для каждого пишущего есть основание предполагать, что если среди этих читателей не один становится для него близким другом, то гораздо больше найдется таких, которые не поймут и профанируют именно самые дорогие его убеждения. Здесь сказывается темная сторона вообще печати: через нее

общение людей между собой чрезвычайно расширилось, но оно не стало лучше и, в особенности, ближе.

[Lit. izq.: 104]

In a letter to Leont'ev, Rozanov described a sense of profanation in the printed publication of his attempts to express the most intimate things:

Но когда увидишь перед собой эти мысли, столь радостно положенные на бумагу - на печатном листе, где-то в Москве отделанные, повсюду читаемые - является неизъяснимо грустное чувство; что-то опустошенное чувствуешь в себе. Точно заветный, милый уголок Вы показали толпе праздных гостей, которые любопытно и равнодушно оглядывают все, что Вы перед ними не раскроете. Не знаю, по-моему - пишущий должен как-то ненавидеть своих читателей: они чужие ему, и, однако, смеют поступать так, как близкие; и ты сам виновник того, что они так поступают с тобой - отсюда презрение к себе <...>.'<sup>7</sup>

Rozanov seeks to escape from the finalizing constrictive evaluation of the reader who seeks definite conclusions. Segal interprets Rozanov's defiant self-absorption as the first step towards an absolutely self-referential and hermetic writing genre, 'первый шаг к замыканию ситуации писания на самое себя'.<sup>8</sup> The influence of the readership on a writer was seen as potentially more detrimental as a result of the expansion in printing,

publishing and literacy. Rozanov compares his writing to the sacred texts of the Middle Ages which were not written for a public but for God:

Ведь в Средних веках не писали для публики, потому что прежде всего не издавали. И средневековая литература во многих отношениях была прекрасна, сильна, трогательна и глубоко плодотворна в своей невидности. Новая литература до известной степени погибла в своей излишней видности; и после изобретения книгопечатания вообще никто не умел и не был в силах преодолеть Гутенберга.

Моя почти таинственная действительная уединенность смогла это. Страхов мне говорил: «Представляйте всегда читателя и пишите, чтобы ему было совершенно ясно». Но сколько я ни усиливался представлять читателя, никогда не мог его вообразить. Ни одно читательское лицо мне не воображалось, ни один оценивающий ум не вырисовывался. И я всегда писал один, в сущности - для себя.

[О. 1. I: 249]

Rozanov saw Strakhov's pedagogic concern for the reader as, ironically, a reason for his lack of success as a writer: 'Страхов вечно болел о читателе, о путанице в уме его и о притуплении в русских читателях нравственных и всяческих вкусов <...>. Это же было и одной из причин его неуспеха.' [Lit. izg.: 242, n.2] Rozanov praised Leont'ev's ability to appear indifferent to his reader: 'Читатель, конечно, стоит где-то в стороне, но Вы его не видите - и

разговариваете с собой. От этого невыразимая прелесть языка Вашего, этих отрывочных, сухих, точных фраз <...>'.<sup>9</sup>

However, it is less the individual reader that Rozanov rejects, than the contemporary readership as a whole, even the writer's anticipated idea of this readership. Rozanov attacked his readers as a 'a crowd of idle guests', lazily observing his literary spectacle, as a waiting 'donkey', merely passive receivers of the word who encouraged the authors of meaning in their illusion of all-powerfulness. In his writing he is seeking to undermine the preconceptions of the reader-writer relationship on which the literary establishment is founded.<sup>10</sup> Rozanov believed that his ideally responsive reader was becoming an increasingly rare phenomenon. In the 1900s he was coming to despair of Russian readers, and had doubts about the future of the book. In 1909 he writes in an article about the critic Izmailov:

Да, русские читатели, когда они были, и были лучшие в мире читатели. «Были?»... Ну, конечно, теперь таких читателей и читательниц давно нет; книги покупают ради занимательной обложки и, разрезав из нее несколько страниц <...> ставят на полку с мыслью: «Это надо будет переплести... в какой корешок?» Читатели настоящие - это вымирающая порода беловежских зубров, и вымирание настоящей критики едва ли не есть лишь частица и симптом общего упадка интереса к книге, нужности книги... Что-то нужно другое?

Не знаем.



Но читатель редок, а критики вовсе нет.<sup>11</sup>

Rozanov's statements show increasing disappointment with the reader, whom he believes has been corrupted by the mass increase in book publishing and who has forgotten literature's original aim, which should not be diversion, but a concentration on life's most important questions. He typifies the mass readership in apocalyptic terms, as a 'demonic herd':

Эх, добрые читатели <...>. От тебя, публика, от твоей серьезности ведь действительно зависит судьба литературы; и, косвенно, - целой страны судьба. Если не будешь знать и любить своих лучших писателей <...> то, конечно, могила стране, могила культуре и образованию <...>.

О стадо, о чудовищное стадо: какой ты ужасный демон... печальный и непобедимый.<sup>12</sup>

Strakhov also recognised the insidious power of popular taste which he claimed was responsible for determining the attitude of the censors: '<...> русские писатели до сих пор находятся в очень тяжелом положении, и едва ли скоро из него выйдут. Не в цензуре дело, а во всей публике, настроение которой естественно отражается и в цензуре.'<sup>13</sup> As Rozanov put it: 'Все писатели - рабы. Рабы своего читателя.' [О. 1. II: 430].

DOSTOEVSKII, ROZANOV, AND THE USE OF INTIMACY IN LITERATURE

Rozanov sought to overcome the impositions of conventional readerly expectation by asserting an entirely new relationship with the reader. While frequently disclaiming the reader and declaring that his writing is for himself, he allows readers to enter this private world on his own terms, which are those of an extreme familiarity and intimacy. Towards the end of his life, in an issue of Apokalipsis nashego vremeni, he writes to his readers:

Естественно, каждому своя душа открыта, и о своей душе я знаю, как она ласкает и бережет (главное!) и хочет унежить и уинтимить (сделать интимною) душу читателя. «Интимное, интимное берегите: всех сокровищ мира дороже интимность вашей души! - то, чего о душе вашей никто не узнает!» <...>.

[Апок.: 625]

Rozanov claimed that he, together with Dostoevskii, was responsible for a radical repositioning of Russian literature. He attributed this to their method of a revolutionary 'intimacy'. He claimed that their method was a way to a greater truth, innovation and revelation in writing. He saw it as something essentially Russian:

Так я «во всей свободе» настолько раскрылся, настолько выражаю суть русской души и с тем вместе выражаю суть того,

что о русских говорил Достоевский. <...> Ведь все русские писатели (этого нельзя скрыть) немножко немцы или экипированы по-немецки. Но как только «все снимешь» (я, «Уед.», «Оп. л.») - станешь непременно «как из Достоевского», т. е. просто «русским».<sup>14</sup>

Достоевский мог бы быть <...> совершенно иных убеждений и остался бы все же Достоевским, сохрани эту теплоту, интимность и манеру. Суть именно в ней и даже не столько в манере, сколько в теплоте и интимности. <...>

Д-го я лет 20 ничего не читал. Знаю. И главное - знаю его метод. Этот метод - субъективность и теплота, но «с походочкой». Как русский станет «таким», т. е. «собой», - он будет «из Достоевского».

Это тайна, могущество и гений Достоевского. <...> И м.б., в словах, сейчас говоримых, я впервые раскрываю, в чем же «суть» Д-го, где его «главное». <...>

Ведь я чувствую, что вся литература русская притворяется, а поцарапай ее - она в сущности «Розанов». И писали бы то же, что я, только не смеют.

Не смеют не притворяться. Не решаются не притворяться. Это страшно, но так.

Но притворство пройдет. И все станут «Розанов», «из Достоевского».

Вот и все.<sup>15</sup>

Rozanov claims that he and Dostoevskii have uncovered

greater psychological profundities than any other Russian writers, by their method of intimacy. They have spoken openly and revealed psychological depths previously under taboo. Rozanov adopted a strikingly intimate tone as a means for breaking with received canons. Bakhtin argued that the role of the intimate and familiar address in writing was to draw closer the writer and the addressee while simultaneously subverting the established order implicit in the existing conventions of literature:

При всем громадном различии между фамиллярными и интимными жанрами (и, соответственно, стилями) они одинаково ощущают своего адресата в большей или меньшей степени вне рамок социальной иерархии и общественных условностей, так сказать «без чинов». Это порождает специфическую откровенность речи (в фамиллярных стилях доходящую иногда до цинизма). В интимных стилях это выражается в стремлении как бы к полному слиянию говорящего с адресатом речи. В фамиллярной речи благодаря отпадению речевых запретов и условностей возможен особый, неофициальный, вольный подход к действительности. <...> когда стоит задача разрушения традиционных официальных стилей и мировоззрений, омертвевших и ставших условными, фамиллярные стили приобретают в литературе большое значение.<sup>16</sup>

For Rozanov the language of the printed journals represents the established authoritarian structure that must be attacked. He sees the distant and indifferent 'herd' of his

readers as the product of contemporary journalism. His assault on the fortress of the journals and their dominance of contemporary literature can be paralleled to Bakhtin's description of the use of familiar and intimate genres in the Renaissance to counteract entrenched structures of authority. Both are attacks on the traditional faiths implicit in the literary language, in the name of more spontaneous truths. 'High' and 'low' tones of speech can freely mingle in a challenge to the delusion that existing hierarchies and conventions are sustained by an incontrovertible truth. Rozanov's writing was characterized by a freedom of speech and familiarity that was sometimes interpreted as cynicism, but it had a serious aim. Rozanov explicitly declared that he was seeking to counteract views and systems that had become formulaic or conventional. His persuasive intimacy was a bid to reinvigorate language and writing.

Viktor Erofeev interprets the use of intimate speech in Rozanov's writing in a similar way to Bakhtin's general analysis. He argues that intimacy (as Rozanov himself declares) does not imply a confession to the reader, but that it has a programmatic aim; to undermine the prevailing faith in the printed word, which symbolized for Rozanov the official style or assumed outlook that constricted the development of thought:

Тонкий и удачливый провокатор, Розанов высмеивает читательское представление о писателях (представление,

которое сообща создали читатели и писатели) <...>. Он снисходит до интимных признаний не столько с целью исповедального самораскрытия <...>, сколько с тем, чтобы подорвать доверие к самой сути печатного слова.<sup>17</sup>

This undermining of previously received truths is political as well as intensely personal. The familiar and intimate styles unite the writer and reader in rebellion against the received ideas that imply a preconceived and value-laden approach to the world. According to Bakhtin, the intimate and familiar genres demand a new dynamic between reader and writer that challenges their conventional relationship, its distancing and formality. By asserting an intense self-revelation, the writer breaks with unspoken taboos. In this way he seeks to break the reader's preconceptions about what is written.

Rozanov's intimacy is more intrusive than Dostoevskii's because it is at a further remove from traditional literary form. The fragmentary style emphasizes the familiar tone of the language, its abbreviative intimacy and lack of explanation for the reader. The very tone of language works to this end, for this language would have been unexpected, even shocking, to a contemporary reader. Bakhtin wrote that familiar and intimate genres gave access to previously 'forbidden' layers of the language, language that had been previously kept within the bounds of speech. Shklovskii identified Rozanov's achievement similarly, as the breaking of taboo. He

described the domesticity of the opavshie list'ia genre as a powerful literary device that created a new literary form.<sup>18</sup> Yet Rozanov claimed that his intimate address was an attempt to overcome literature by reducing the boundaries between literature and life, thought and writing.

As well as having a definite cognitive aim, the freedom from traditional responsibilities to the reader in the intimate and familiar genres allowed for an irreverence, a seeming frivolity which was in fact guaranteed by its complete seriousness. For Rozanov, mockery of the reader, self-contradiction and outlandish statement were a bid against the prevalent hypocrisy of literature and had in fact clear intentions for the reader. This is a variation of the literary 'iurodstvo', discussed in the first chapter, which Bakhtin identified as a genre. Like its living counterpart, the seeming 'play' had important religious and moral implications.

The familiar and intimate address to the reader was not a renunciation of the writer's authoritative role. The new intimacy with the reader was subtly commanding, it controlled the reader's response while undermining his traditional assumptions about literature. The language assumes an easy familiarity with the reader but the writer has ultimate control of this intimacy. The reader is in the somewhat uncomfortable position of feeling that the writer knows his hidden thoughts and is not afraid to declare them or challenge him. Dostoevskii's Zapiski iz podpol'ia was an

important example of this genre. Unable to rely on the established linguistic and stylistic conventions that would make evident a familiar meaning, the reader is thrown on to the mercy of this over intimate conversationalist. Zapiski iz podpol'ia is a bid to renounce a certain, anticipated reader, who had a preconceived reaction to what was being said. Critics have compared Rozanov's capricious and contradictory speech to the hero of Zapiski iz podpol'ia. He too, engages with the reader only to throw him off, uses different styles, even introduces a direct readerly voice, which is at times used to mock the reader. Like Dostoevskii's writer of Zapiski iz podpol'ia, Rozanov claimed to be absolutely free from others' evaluation. He presented himself in a consciously shocking or repellent way, in order to assert this freedom and alienate the imposing reader:

С выпученными глазами и облизывающийся - вот я. Некрасиво? Что делать.

[O. 1. II: 332]

Такая неестественно отвратительная фамилия дана мне в дополнение к мизерабельному виду. <...> Конечно, побочным образом и как «пустяки», внешняя непривлекательность была причиной самоуглубления.

[Ued.: 54-55]

Bakhtin described the defiantly repellent self-presentation



of the protagonist of Zapiski iz podpol'ia as similarly aimed at a deeper self-exploration:

Разрушение своего образа в другом, загрязнение его в другом, как последняя отчаянная попытка освободиться от власти над собой чужого сознания и пробиться к себе самому для себя самого, - такова установка всей исповеди «человека из подполья». Поэтому он делает свое слово о себе нарочито безобразным.<sup>19</sup>

By concentrating the focus of debate inwards, Dostoevskii can further his exploration of the mind's internal contradictions of argument. However the words of both the underground man and Rozanov demonstrate that no speech can begin from a sense of complete and absolute isolation. The underground man is shown to be ultimately dependent on his reader, and on his own literary self-consciousness, he is in fact in desperate need of his reader. He moves from rhetoric to intimacy as if to trick the readerly expectations, and an insistent internal self-contradiction before the reader is a dynamic of his thought. Rozanov's attitude to the reader and the aims of his writing, though they have their source in Dostoevskii's writing, evolve with a different intent. Rozanov took Dostoevskii's revolution in literature a stage further, his writing became a reaction against literature itself. His writing is significantly different to Dostoevskii's in that it does not engage with an invented and ultimately literary self as

in Zapiski iz podpol'ia, but with his own biographical self. The dialogue is a reaction to events of life as much as to literature.

Dostoevskii does not seek to undermine the veneration in which literature is held, he shares in this veneration but sought only to further literature's potential influence on Russian readers. Unlike Dostoevskii, Rozanov's questioning of literature's power led him to doubt the very basis of literature. His writing is an attempt to lay bare not only the inherent contradictions of received literary ideas, as Dostoevskii does, but the contradiction between literature and life itself, which, he argued, had become unsustainable. Dostoevskii makes use of a radically new, intimate voice which seems to emerge from unmediated life, but it is ultimately a literary device. Dostoevskii never doubted the transformative potential of literature. His attack on literary preconceptions is fuelled by his faith in the power of literature. His writing still belonged to a tradition, inspired by Belinskii, that had a huge faith in the potential of literature to change life. He hoped to challenge and develop the thoughts of his reader by involving him inescapably in this intense solitary soul-searching. For Dostoevskii, the attempt to involve reader and writerly consciousness more intimately was not an evasion of literature's conventional programmatic role, but an attempt to transform this role, to reveal new potential, founded on a faith in the social implications of the psychological influence his writing could have.<sup>20</sup>

Rozanov's recourse to the intimate reader could be seen as a flight from the world of literature, which he believed had been corrupted by too high an expectation of its transformative potential, the very potential that Dostoevskii upheld. Rozanov claimed that mass publication could create an illusion of intimacy that was actually a powerful distancing force. Instead he seeks a few intimate readers, empathetic, 'unknown friends', who would unite with him in an absolute, uncritical understanding. In a review of Okolo tserkovnykh sten, Rozanov's friend and ally, the writer I. F. Romanov (Rtsy), anticipated Rozanov's address to an imagined ideal reader long before the publication of Uedinennoe:

Но мы верим, мы знаем, что у нашего автора есть свой неперемѣнный и неизмѣняющійся читатель, который, несмотря на полное отсутствие соприкосновения в личной жизни, несмотря иной раз на громадное географическое отдаление, так близок к автору, как если бы принадлежал к кругу его личных знакомых, его родных, его ближайших ближних. Этот не изменит автору. Этот, во всяком случае, прочтет новую книгу Розанова. Любопытная черточка, на которой стоит несколько остановиться.<sup>21</sup>

In a letter to the critic Glinka (Volzhskii), defending the continued publication of his private and 'manuscript' literature, Rozanov described the readers that he was writing for:

Из 5-6-10 писем я узнал, что впечатление «Уединенного» было огромное и именно таково, каково мне безумно хотелось от литературы чужой, и моей: унежить, растрогать, углубить душу, снять с нее «сюртук» (формальность, внешность).

Я почувствовал, что у этих <...> души прильнули к моей, слились с моею. Это было не «почитание писателя», а - родное.<sup>22</sup>

Rozanov's statements anticipate Bakhtin's descriptions of an idealized complete union of speaker and addressee. Bakhtin describes the reader of intimate genres in a way that directly echoes Rozanov's own prescription for his ideal reader:

Интимные жанры и стили основаны на максимальной внутренней близости говорящего и адресата речи (в пределе - как бы на слиянии их). Интимная речь проникнута глубоким доверием к адресату, к его сочувствию - к чуткости и благожелательности его ответного понимания. В этой атмосфере говорящий раскрывает свои внутренние глубины.<sup>23</sup>

Rozanov denied access to conventional readers demanding a clear ideological 'message', but repeatedly made appeals, both in published and unpublished writing, to the readers whose souls would unite with his. It is in the anticipation of such a reader that he performs his self-uncovery, revealing his private thoughts. In this he fulfils Bakhtin's prescription for a unity of consciousness between

reader and writer that would be revolutionary in its literary effects.

Rozanov described this ideal intimate exchange as the basis of connection between reader and writer. He sought to restate the relationship between reader and writer in almost religious terms. The writer can intrude on the reader's private and unspoken thoughts just as much as the imagined reader does on the writer. The reader also has a right to keep some things free from speech:

На душе читателя, как на крыльях бабочки, лежит та нижняя последняя пылица, которой не смеет, не знает коснуться никто, кроме Бога. Но вот и обратно: значит, интимность души читателя взяла внутрь себя интимную душу писателя.

[Апок.: 626]

Both reader and writer have a responsibility to the seriousness of their task. Indeed, for all his supposed disclaiming of his readers, Rozanov actually places great emphasis on the active role and significance of the reader. In his introduction to Okolo tserkovnykh sten, he insists on the dependence of his writing on an imagined reader, in a relationship that is 'inexpressibly intimate':

Есть нечто связующее между автором и читателями, хотя он их не видит, не слышит. Я заскучал о своих читателях в привычной газете, и очень грустно было бы, если-бы в ответ на горячо схваченное перо, они вдруг сказали кисло - «опять

этот несносный писатель».

<...>

Странна жизнь писателей: жизнь мечты, иллюзии. Возможно, что он говорит «в трубу» и «на ветер»: но при таком представлении, все равно все продумав про себя - автор ничего бы не напечатал. Он именно <...> создает в воображении каких-то друзей, что-то невыразимо интимное <...>. Он кружится в каком-то вихре слов, произносит речи совершенно невероятные в одиночестве, интимничает, исповедует и исповедуется, хитрит, увлекает <...>.<sup>24</sup>

Rozanov writes of an almost telepathic communication, an 'intimate circle' between him and his ideal readers. The imagined reader is a spur to writing:

Вообще, я думаю, литература есть настолько же дело читателя, творчество читателя, насколько есть творчество и дело писателя. Тут есть круг интимности, иногда почти телепатической. <...> Сочувствием и пониманием, раздражением или негодованием читатели создают пищу для писателя; волнуясь про себя, и иногда волнуясь даже не выходя из кабинета, они каким-то телепатическим способом сообщают свое волнение и пишущему. «Вот о чем нужно подумать»; «вот что нужно принять во внимание».<sup>25</sup>

In his 1915 Mimoletnoe, Rozanov transcribes a letter from one of these few ideally comprehending readers who restores his faith in his task and again he insists on his hopes for

the reader's soul: 'За всю мою литературную деятельность такого письма - по музыке тона, наклону к «помолиться Богу», <...> я не получал. И когда я говорил: «хотел бы унежить душу» - я говорил об этом.'<sup>26</sup>

Rozanov seeks to affirm a spiritual connection with his reader in a way that was quite at odds with the prevalent style of journalism. He aims to break with the traditional role of writer in order to enter into the lives of his readers. In the letter to Glinka mentioned above he writes of having been summoned by his readers into their homes, the nurseries and bedrooms.<sup>27</sup> Rozanov's writing is a bid to take literature out of a literary context and into the most domestic, everyday and ephemeral surroundings. It is this that he seeks to locate for his reader, as a source of value and culture outside literature.

Rozanov claimed to draw closer to the essential needs of his readers by his spiritual renunciation of the reading public. In doing this he actually seeks more than a mere literary influence. He claims to be a presence 'at the reader's tea table', with his family and children, to enter into the most intimate, hidden details of his domestic and spiritual life. As discussed earlier, the highly intonational style of Rozanov's work is a presumption of extreme intimacy. Rozanov does not explain what the initials and nicknames stand for in his opavshie list'ia genre.<sup>28</sup> He claimed to want readers who would understand him as he did himself, and he assumed that they would understand his context in the 'telepathic' circle of reader

and writer.

In publicly renouncing the traditional role of the writer as teacher, Rozanov hoped to assume an even greater influence than that previously assumed in a literary career. Rozanov emphasizes that the spiritual care of its readers is the only truly valuable concern of literature. In his introduction to the first major collected edition of Dostoevskii's works he writes: '<...> вне отношения писателя к нашим индивидуальным тревогам, заботам, опасениям празден смысл самого чтения, незначаще появление книги, мишурно все, что в необъятных размерах мы называем литературой'.<sup>29</sup> Segal emphasizes this engagement with actual daily details as the crucial distinction between Dostoevskii's intimate address to the reader, that remained purely literary, and Rozanov's personal approach:

«Дневник писателя» принципиально отделен совершенно непроницаемой стеной от всего бытово, частного, жизненного-личностного между адресатом и пишущим. «Дневник Писателя» адресовано всем, всей заинтересованной публике, в нем нет частных документов, личных писем, первоначально не предназначавшихся для печати. Ни автор, ни тем более его «собеседники» не предстают здесь в своей бытовой ипостаси.<sup>30</sup>

The success of Rozanov's aim of addressing the closest everyday concerns of his reader can be seen from the letters that he received in reply to his books and



articles, many of which were published in subsequent books and articles. These are characterized by trust, affection and extreme self-revelation, as if these readers really did believe that they had been taken into his confidence. They show a response to both the public and the private, domestic themes of Rozanov's writing. Many of these letters are from women, who reveal the difficulties of their family and even sexual lives. They enquire after the fates of Rozanov's own family as if they are close friends. It seemed that in his 'intimate' prose Rozanov had touched on themes that were not considered shocking by these women but on which there was rather an impatience to speak out: sex, the family and the home. It is Rozanov's emotive appeal for the sacred value of these conventionally unspoken themes that appears to move these readers to write. Thus Rozanov's use of the intimate genre breaks with the conventional social authority not only by challenging the values inherent in the prevailing literary style, but by making a direct challenge to literary subject matter. Indeed, Rozanov so diminished the gap between literary and real life in his relationship with the reader that his last major publication, Apokalipsis nashego vremeni, contains real pleas to his readers for donations of food to feed their writer, which were actually answered by some readers.<sup>31</sup>

Rozanov saw himself as representing the unspoken anxieties of those who did not have a voice in print. He even transformed the reader's role by giving him this

voice, publishing readers' letters and life stories in full, to a degree that seemed unnecessarily extensive or irrelevant to those accustomed to the traditional agenda of 'serious issues'. Rozanov was doing more than challenging the traditional hierarchy of important topics. He was seeking to thwart the control of the published word by journalists and established literary figures by introducing voices that had never been heard: 'Таким образом богословский монолог местами разветвляется у меня в диалог и даже поли-олог (речи многих), как-бы ведущийся возле церковных стен и об этих самых стенах.'<sup>32</sup> Rozanov's use of his readers' letters in his works breaks with what he saw as a monologic control of existing literature. The polyphony of his own varied voices and styles is extended by the inclusion of actual contemporary voices, which were often those of women or people of low social standing, both rarely given such a wide audience. In this way reader and writer are engaged in a joint task in breaking with the boundaries traditionally imposed by print. As well as the introduction of real readers, Rozanov also gives voice to an imaginary reader, whose response he anticipates:

И нас хотят уверить, что мы или вообще из нас кто-то «чаёт воскресения мертвых»... Красивая риторика вокруг нашего бездушия: ни я не «чаю», ни ты, читатель, - не «чаешь»; <...> наконец - ни закон и общество...

- Чаю ...

- Что «чаю»?

- Чаю «воскресения мертвых».
- Ну вот не ожидал.<sup>33</sup>

This affectionate exchange assumes a close link between the writer and his imagined reader. Yet Rozanov uses the imagined reader's objection to break up the thrust of his monologue and allow the argument to take different directions. The effect is humorous and intimate and allows Rozanov himself to take on a different tone of voice in the midst of his argument.

Like Rozanov, Bakhtin emphasizes the many coexistent voices and arguments rather than a single truth. He too claimed that the monologue must break off into a 'polylogue' (or 'polyphony'). Bakhtin insisted that consciousness was not an hermetically sealed monologic entity, but that it must be elucidated in the midst of, and in response to, a plurality of different voices and arguments, remembered, immediate and anticipated. He believed that it was possible to envisage a special polyphonic artistic thinking extending beyond the bounds of the novel as a genre. Rozanov defended his own various and contradictory expressions against the criticisms of those contemporaries who demanded a single ideological line. He made it clear that his readers could not expect any definite conclusions, they could only hope to become more responsive to the constant process of self-elucidation. He emphasized that reading is as complex a task as this process of self-understanding, demanding a constant open

ear to the various tones and forms of expression, even if these seem contradictory. There is no final summation. In an answer to Chukovskii's and Struve's attack on the 'unprincipled' contradictions of his writing, Rozanov attacked the demands of his critics that he formulate a consistent argument. In Rozanov's view, his consistency was in the multiplicity of his views. In this passage he argues that readers can learn from the constant flux and contradiction that is his 'method', and in this way free themselves from the dogma of book 'truths', to their own thoughts:

- Сколько можно иметь мнений, мыслей о предмете?

- Сколько угодно... Сколько есть «мыслей» в самом предмете: ибо нет предмета без мысли, и иногда - без множества в себе мыслей.

- Итак, по-вашему, можно иметь сколько угодно нравственных «взглядов на предмет», «убеждений» о нем?

- По-моему и по-умному - сколько угодно.

<...> именно в те блаженные минуты, когда я «кнаружи» засыпаю, и наступают те «несколько минут», когда вдруг «сто убеждений» сложатся об одном предмете <...>.

- Страшно и как-то безнадежно для читателя... Где же тогда истина?

- В полноте всех мыслей. Разом. Со страхом выбрать одну. В колебании.

- Неужели же колебание - принцип?

- Первый в жизни. Единственный, который тверд. Тот,

которым цветет все, и все - живет. Наступи-ка устойчивость и мир закаменел бы, заледенел. <...> все в «колебаниях», «переменах», в тенях и рассветах - до полной невозможности что-нибудь ухватить... Глупый растеривается их видя; но умный и умное время на них воспитывается, вооружается не содержанием их, а их методом, и сам получает способность рождать мысли...<sup>34</sup>

To the accusations of the contradictions between his book on the 1905 revolution, Kogda nachal'stvo ushlo, and his later articles, Rozanov answers the indignance of his imagined reader:

- <...> Что же прикажете думать и чему следовать?
- Статьям и книге. Статьям - непременно! Но и книге - непременно!
- Но ведь они исключают друг друга?
- Исключают. А вот вы в своей живой душе - и соедините. Поработайте. Попотейте. А то - что «братъ готовенькое»... Ослиное дело. Я же и статьи пишу, и книгу написал с надеждой, что работаю не на конюшне, а в литературе.<sup>35</sup>

The image of the donkey-like reader anticipates the opening of Uedinennoe, published two years later: 'С читателем гораздо скучнее, чем одному. Он разинет рот и ждет, что ты ему положишь? В таком случае он имеет вид осла перед тем, как ему зареветь. Зрелище не из прекрасных...' [Ued.: 36]

The intimation of indifference or idle curiosity of many of his readers makes a mockery of Rozanov's literary aims. Mass publication meant that ideas could now be circulated more broadly, but the ideas themselves were more banal and simplistic. The compensation of a few sympathetic readers was not always enough. Frustration or even despair with a contemporary readership can lead to a defensive bid at a certain 'receptive understanding' somewhere, at some time, perhaps in the future. The writer frees himself from the poverty of the contemporary readership by declaring: 'пишу для себя...для каких-то неведомых друзей'. [Ued.: 36]

#### THE READER IN TIME

The unknown reader in the future is the last resort for a writer who is writing against the prevailing values and interpretations of his times. Osip Mandel'shtam shows similar needs in his article 'O sobesednike' where he writes of the difficulty of speaking directly to one's immediate contemporaries:

Когда мы говорим, мы ищем в лице собеседника санкции, подтверждения нашей правоте. Тем более поэт. <...>

<...> Почему же не живой конкретный собеседник, не «представитель эпохи», не «друг в поколении»? Я отвечаю: обращение к конкретному собеседнику обескрыливает стих, лишает его воздуха, полета. <...>

Страх перед конкретным собеседником, слушателем из

«эпохи», тем самым «другом в поколении», настойчиво преследовал поэтов во все времена.<sup>36</sup>

<...> поэзия, как целое, всегда направляется к более или менее далекому, неизвестному адресату, в существовании которого поэт не может сомневаться, не усомнившись в себе. Метафизика здесь ни при чем. Только реальность может вызвать к жизни другую реальность.<sup>37</sup>

In this essay, Mandel'shtam writes of poems after a poet's death being alive as events and not merely as traces of past life,<sup>38</sup> anticipating Bakhtin in his use of the word sobytiia. The statement is very close to Bakhtin's statements on the life of the word. The anxiety about the need for a future responsive reader was perhaps most prolonged in the life of Mikhail Bakhtin. Central to Bakhtin's ideas is the idea of a supra-addressee, who is a source of appeal and an interlocutor beyond the limitations of the immediate context:

<...> кроме этого адресата (второго) автор высказывания с большей или меньшей осознанностью предполагает высшего наадресата (третьего), абсолютно справедливое ответное понимание которого предполагается либо в метафизической дали, либо в далеком историческом времени.<sup>39</sup>

This third other, who can be variously understood as God, an ultimate source of appeal or a certain reader in time,

shows an all-comprehending reception of the utterance: an ideally true receptive understanding ('идеально верное ответное понимание').<sup>40</sup> This was very much what Rozanov claimed to be seeking from his readers, particularly in the opavshie list'ia genre. In his precarious relationship with the reader in this genre, Rozanov attempts to preserve a sense of isolated self-accountability. Only a reader who has absolute understanding can fuel his writing and self-exploration, which meant that Rozanov, as he admitted, often had to invent his immediate reader. In the context of a Bakhtinian analysis, Rozanov sought an almost exclusive reliance on the third other or supra-addressee, to the exclusion of an immediate interlocutor.

Rozanov, Mandel'shtam and Bakhtin were all writing against the prevailing power of the time, but with increasingly threatening consequences. Despite his continual battles with the censors, Rozanov actually had great freedoms. His enemies were the supposed opposition, the secretly rich and powerful radical press. However, Rozanov found dialogue with contemporaries, in the letters of readers, with the conservative and obscure 'literary exiles', and even among the sophisticated 'decadents'. When Mandel'shtam was writing his prose articles of the 1920s the situation was already more hostile, and more lonely. It is not surprising that he recognizes in Rozanov, despite his literary anarchism, someone who sought to defend a sense of a responsive, dialogic community bound by shared associations and values: the 'we' referred to by Nadezhda



Mandel'shtam.<sup>41</sup> Increasingly at a loss to find this 'we', both Mandel'shtam and Bakhtin had to rely on an unknown reader in the future, in whose understanding their words would at last find a responsive addressee. They show the impossibility of writing purely 'for oneself' without hope of a reader or witness. Words are written in the faith that one can express and be understood, that there is a valid meaning.

Aleksandr Benois suggested to Rilke that he should read Rozanov's work,<sup>42</sup> and Rilke responded enthusiastically, even contemplating the possibility of translating Rozanov. In a letter to Benois, urging him to send copies of Rozanov's work, Rilke describes the philosophy he anticipates finding. He describes his own antipathy to the systems that impose themselves on one individual's thought. He praises Dostoevskii as a prime example of this human, anti-dogmatic word. He claims that Dostoevskii will have more importance for Russia than Christ, since, like Rozanov, he saw Christ's words as not unconstrained by the systematizing, scholastic impulse, 'человеческое, не превращенное в догму слово, будет для России более существенным, чем было для Европы слово Иисуса Назарейвского, которое оказалось втиснутым в рамки громоздких систем.'<sup>43</sup> He believes philosophy's essence is in the everyday struggles of men in the process of questioning their lives: 'на деле она является лишь грандиозным образом жизненного пути ее создателя, боровшегося с жизнью и смертью'.<sup>44</sup>

Rilke writes that philosophers cannot rely on the sympathetic understanding of the time in which they live. True philosophers and poets are 'contemporaries of people of the far-off future'.<sup>45</sup> Like Mandel'shtam, he wrote of the danger of contemporary judgements distorting the purity of the true thinker's search. In a spirit very similar to Rozanov, Rilke writes of the need for the philosopher to avoid definitions and systems and be new each day: 'Он может лишь быть ежедневно новым, как тот, кто опровергает самого себя.'<sup>46</sup> Rilke believed that Rozanov understood philosophy in this way. He believed that Rozanov was the philosopher that he was seeking in Russia; one who was alien to philosophical systems and dogmas, but who understood the poetry of everyday observation. Benois sent Rilke Priroda i istoriia and Literaturnye ocherki. Uedinennoe was not published until eleven years later, yet Rilke's understanding of the tasks of the philosopher, writer and reader are very close to the anxieties that fuel Rozanov's attempt at self-elucidation through writing.

CHAPTER IV: LETTERS, MANUSCRIPT, PRINT AND THE PRESS

Rozanov's attempt to emphasize the spoken word and intonation to the maximum in his printed writing, through innovations in literary style, punctuation and presentation, is a conscious bid to preserve the words that are rooted in place and connection with intimates, with intonational resonance and unspoken meanings, against the simplifying uniformity of mass publication. The loss of individuality in published writing was something that Rozanov frequently complained about, and blamed on the 'freezing' effects of the printing press and mass-produced ideas. For Rozanov, an idea should contain the heat of spontaneity, be fervently held, and expressed in excited whispers, in intimacy, in the privacy of a conversation or correspondence, where the setting is the private study, not the street or marketplace. Yet Rozanov also wanted to give this intimacy life in the mass publication that he claimed to fear and despise.

Rozanov sought to overcome the effects of the technological innovations in printing and distribution by himself proving even more innovatory than his enemies; thus he sought to make the life of the spoken word and manuscript a principle of his printed publication. He tried to find new forms of 'literature' that could express these aims. As he argued in print, the traditional forms of written expression, both in newspapers and books, were worn out. No book was as revealing or engaging as a living

conversation. A living person was unpredictable, and could be much more interesting about a subject in the haphazard and fragmentary train of his thought, when it was not being constrained to the formal order and authoritative tone of a book or journal article. Rozanov claimed that people were tired of the conventional feuilleton or newspaper article, and would read a private correspondence with far greater appetite and attention. He sought to stimulate literary forms with these borrowings from private life, from personal conversations and correspondence.

### LETTERS

Rozanov believed that letters were a rare written form which preserved the individuality and intimacy that was the origin of true writing. It is in an attempt to reassert this intimacy and originality that Rozanov tries to bring the letter into the marketplace of journalism, to use it as a literary form that would be contained within or replace the article or essay, in order to counteract the effects of mass publication by the enforcement of a private, intimate style. Similarly to the way that Rozanov emphasized the talent of thinkers such as Shperk, whose speech was compelling, but whose literary style was incomprehensible, Rozanov claimed that there were some genuinely talented writers who had no success in print, but whose letters were full of a rare literary vitality. He called these letters 'an underground literature': 'Это суть «подпольная

литература», не попавшая к свету в свое время, но при внимании будущих библиографов она может внести в литературу неожиданную яркую полосу, стать ее украшением и славой.<sup>1</sup>

Writers who were successful in print were less likely to produce the powerful and energetic letters of those whose thoughts were suppressed by exclusion. Rozanov paid particular attention to the letters of the unfashionable writers who were not widely published, and saw their letters as their true literature, which he intended to publish as a series under the title, 'Literaturnye izgnanniki'.<sup>2</sup> Part of this project was achieved during his lifetime, in the publications of his letters from Strakhov, Govorukha-Otrok, Leont'ev and Suvorin;<sup>3</sup> he published various other correspondences during his lifetime, and intended to publish many more.<sup>4</sup> He kept the letters that he received from his correspondents like an archive, in envelopes, with his own notes on the individual character of the sender, his significance in Russian cultural life and for himself personally. Rozanov combined the letter form with the conversational: his commentaries and footnotes provided the spontaneous and fragmentary opportunity for conversational asides, anecdote and aphorism that he valued in direct human contact over conventional book forms.<sup>5</sup> Yet Rozanov had the further advantage that this was itself an artifice that he could manipulate to his advantage.

Rozanov claimed that he valued the letter form for its artlessness. A letter was often written at such speed, or

in such a state of exhaustion, that there was not time for the writer to 'take a pose'. Instead the casualness and tiredness with which a letter was written could often reveal connections of thought, or subconscious conclusions, that were far more valuable than the enforced argument, 'dressed up', 'trying', and 'posing', of an article intended for print: 'Сочинения автора - это то, чем он хотел казаться. Письма его - то, что он есть.'<sup>6</sup> A letter could show the motions of thought in the process of elucidating itself. A letter can be like talking to oneself, yet with the sense of an imagined sympathetic, understanding reader whose receptive understanding stimulates the process of thought as it tries to make itself clear. It is truer than an article because it emphasizes the continuous and arbitrary nature of this process. Characteristically, however, Rozanov's presentation of writers' letters allows him to take poses. He controls the entire presentation, and revises his own responses at the time of writing. The publication of footnotes allows Rozanov to interject his own views and exclamations at any point, to break up even this form and make it more fragmentary and conversational. The footnotes are far more important to Rozanov than publishing his own side of the correspondence. They allow him to throw himself into the discussion at any point, with interjections, contradictions, simple exclamations, or lengthy descriptive asides. Viktor Sukach describes Rozanov's use of the footnote as a fundamental distinction between him and the

writers and thinkers who were his contemporaries.<sup>7</sup> Tat'iana Pomeranskaia argues: 'истинный Розанов не столько в его книгах, сколько в этих подстрочных рассуждениях и восклицаниях на полях чужих писем'.<sup>8</sup> Rozanov himself recognized that his footnotes were a crucial part of his whole work, and could not be separated from it: 'некоторые острые стрелы (завершения, пики) всего моего мирозерцания выразились просто в примечании к чужой статье'. [O. L. I: 284] The practice of publishing letters was already established, but Rozanov transformed the art of the footnote. His footnotes were not only devised for the publication of a private correspondence. He would include public and private letters, and polemical articles, in the middle of an article or book chapter, and use this as a foil for debate from the floor, or footnote.<sup>9</sup> In this way Rozanov cleverly appears to distance himself from the pose of didactic author and can shout and criticize or applaud from an 'off-stage' position. He seemingly becomes part of the audience, closer to the readers themselves, although in fact he is in control of the whole performance; directing the speech, interjections, barracking and applause to the utmost effect. In this way Rozanov could voice his own impassioned opinions without the task of structuring a sustained logical argument, in a way that is designed to win over the reader without appearing didactic or laborious. Rozanov himself declared that his talent was reactive. He did not seek to impose arguments or structures or ready-formed ideas. The most important 'themes' of his

life were all reactions to events that had disturbed him: education, marriage and the church, the popular press, the fate of his writer contemporaries, and his private emotions. What adds a particular sharpness to his device is that Rozanov exploits a form that is associated with an academic, compilatory and deferential attitude to knowledge, which he publicly abhorred. He would quote inaccurately, feeling it a waste of time to check a reference. He believed that people should write from their own thoughts and experience and not seek the security of a framework of reference and citation as if this were a greater guarantee of truth. The truth was in one's own attempt to make sense of the random facts one encountered. All edifices of learning were redundant unless they had been gained in relation to the deepest sources of one's life. Thus Rozanov transforms a genre he praises for its 'artlessness', by making it even more fragmentary, heterogeneous and seemingly spontaneous through the power of his literary art.

Although Rozanov defended the importance of publishing private letters, not intended for publication, he insisted that their value lay in their specifically private nature. He introduces his publication of Solov'ev's letters in Voprosy zhizni by saying that they ought not really to be published: 'Писульки эти, собственно, не следовало бы издавать.'<sup>10</sup> This statement is typical of Rozanov's manipulation of the private into the public literary sphere, while still asserting its private authority.



Rozanov emphasizes that it is the private and intimate characteristics of the correspondence that he wants his readers to concentrate on. He wants readers to make contact with the individual voice conveyed in the turns of phrase and mannerisms that are revealed in the privacy of a private room, away from the obligations of public writing. Rozanov describes the effect of reading Solov'ev's letters, and explains why he has decided to publish them:

<...> если простой почерк его писем взволновал меня, то иному безмолвному другу его может показаться милым, дорогим, памятным простой оборот его речи, как бы сказанной в комнате и без всяких особых намерений. Мне лично «литература частных писем» всегда казалась самой интересною и дорогою: интересна она потому, что если скажется в письме дело, - то уже такой сердцевинной стороне своей, какая редко сказывается в книгах, <...> а дорога эта литература от того, что нигде так, как в частном письме, не скажется неуловимое, незаметное в человеке или писателе, что его характеризует.<sup>11</sup>

Rozanov sought to counteract the uniformity of literary journalism by the exploitation of the invigorating power of the letter form, as he explains in the introduction to his new column for the journal Novyi put':

Читатель извинит меня, если в некоторых случаях я значительно отойду от общепринятых в литературе способов

изложения своих мыслей. Мне кажется, печатная бумага вообще несколько утомила современные вкусы. Ведь мы с большим интересом читаем частное письмо, чем газетный лист. Отчего журналу и журналистике не последовать этим изменившимся вкусам?<sup>12</sup>

When asked by the Merezhkovskiis to write an article on the Russian Church for a collection of essays on Russian religion, the Church and the revolution, to be published in France, Rozanov chose to write in the form of a letter, and defended his form thus:

<...> я предпочитаю закругленной форме обработанного литературного очерка - простое письмо, скромность которого и безыскусственное течение более отвечают существу предмета, бесконечно интимного и дорогого всякому (религия), шаткого, болеющего (церковь). <...> Я думаю, «религия» вообще не для книг, не для журналов или газет, и, извините меня - не для «сборников»: во всяком случае, вводя сюда ее - надо быть крайне деликатным и осторожным...<sup>13</sup>

Rozanov argues that religion is like a human life, immensely fragile and important, it should be discussed, like a sick person's state of health, only in the whispers of involved intimates. The private letter is the only acceptable literary form for such an intimate topic. The impersonality and pseudo-scientific style of journalism is likened to the sterility and lack of emotion of medical

science in its approach to human life. Nevertheless he himself continued to publish books of articles on religion, which he set apart from contemporary journalism. Rozanov attacked the false objectivity that he believed was being claimed increasingly by such printed materials, newspapers, journals and books. He encouraged readers to return to the source of writing, which he sees as the activity of the individual, writing private notes of his thoughts and feelings, for himself, for another, but not for the general reading public. Rozanov argues that private letters are the true literature of a people, as they contain the real voices and intonations of their time, as opposed to the artificial inventions of 'literature':

Почтмейстер, заглядывавший в частные письма («Ревизор»), был хорошего литературного вкуса человек.

<...>

Читая иногда письма прислуге, я бывал поражен красками народного говора, народной души, народного мировоззрения и быта. И думал: «Да это - литература, прекраснейшая литература».

Письма писателей вообще скучны, бесцветны.<...> все письма их - полинявшие, тусклые, без «говора». Их бы и печатать не стоило. Но корреспонденция частных людей истинно замечательна.

Каждый век (в частных письмах) говорит своим языком. Каждое сословие. Каждый человек.

Вместо «ерунды в повестях» выбросить бы из журналов

эту новейшую беллетристику и вместо ее...

Ну - печатать дело: науку, рассуждения, философию.

Но иногда, а впрочем, лучше в отдельных книгах вот произвести чемодан старых писем. Цветков и Гершензон много бы оттуда выудили. Да и «зачитался бы с задумчивостью» иной читатель, немногие серьезные люди...

[O. I. I: 234]

Letters are a possible source of real life, both in the language and the subjects of concern, that could aid the renewal of the stagnant and self-referential state of literary journalism by awakening readers and writers to the wealth of national language and thought existing independently of what is the prescribed 'literature'. In a letter to Gershenzon, Rozanov says that in reading Gershenzon's book on Chaadaev, he far prefers the letters to Chaadaev from unknown women to Chaadaev's own 'philosophical' letters: 'это - настоящее, живое. В Чаад<аеве> хорошо только остроумие.'<sup>14</sup>

Rozanov himself published the letters of unknown women and men in the opavshie list'ia,<sup>15</sup> in his books of essays on religious themes, as well as in his published articles. Frequently these letters would make up almost the entire text, and Rozanov's voice would make itself heard in the footnotes, in reaction to the text. This method is notable in V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, Semeinyi vopros v Rossii, Okolo tserkovnykh sten, Temnyi lik, Voina 1914 goda i russkoe vozrozhdenie, and throughout the opavshie list'ia

genre. In Okolo tserkovnykh sten, Rozanov seeks to give publicity to voices that were engaged in more public questions, but who were still excluded from print and publication. He gives a public, mass audience, in print, to the private and at times anonymous manuscripts of people who frequently had no literary ambitions at all. They transcend the deadening effect of print by their nature, which is at the heart of life and true utterance. In this collection, there is a section entitled 'Golosa iz provintsii o missionerstve', which Rozanov introduces by arguing that there are certain subjects where one authorial voice is not enough to express the many-sidedness of the debate. This is particularly the case with the question of religious sects.<sup>16</sup> Amongst other extracts from letters, he publishes in full a long letter from a landowner, Vera Grinevich: 'Письмо это мне представляется одним из лучших литературных памятников общественного и духовно-религиозного содержания.'<sup>17</sup> Rozanov describes the refusal to publish this letter by religious and secular newspapers and journals, despite the fact that it had the approval of religious leaders in St Petersburg and of leading members of the St Petersburg Religious and Philosophical Society. In a later article for this collection, Rozanov publishes another letter from this correspondent, 'without an academic diploma, a housekeeper and mother of a family',<sup>18</sup> for comparison with a public lecture by Archimandrite Nikon; he introduces the latter, more worldly important speaker thus: 'Теперь послушаем человека, который не присел

на минуту к письменному столу, чтобы написать безыскусственное «письмо в редакцию» о том, что видит кругом себя и о чем страдает его сердце, а приготовился торжественно к речи в торжественном собрании.'<sup>19</sup>

In this way, Rozanov seeks to demonstrate the superior value of what is seen and lived over the most elevated learning in religious matters. Indeed he believed that it was particularly in religious matters that the experience of life over learning was crucial: 'Сравнение: чем занята мысль, воображение и сердце одной и другого; что вынесут читатели этого письма и той лекции - даст обильную пищу для размышления читателя этой книги'.<sup>20</sup>

In Voina 1914 goda i russkoe vozrozhdenie, Rozanov published letters from soldiers and from mothers and wives, to give a more immediate sense of the impact of war than any literary description. He also prints a letter from a woman who suggests that he publish a collection of letters home from soldiers. He exclaims, in a footnote, that he has had exactly the same idea (perhaps an example of the 'telepathic communication' that he alluded to in his relations with his readers), and appeals to readers to send him any documents they have. He says that this collection would constitute 'speech from the war' ('govor s voiny').<sup>21</sup> Rozanov believed that writers proved false in seeking to fix an immortal pose in print. The value of the voice that is expressed in a letter is that it recognizes its transitoriness, and in this, Rozanov believed, lay the secret of its authenticity:

Наша «великолепная» литература, прижизненно печатаемая, вся или почти вся с этим невинно-робким привираньем; где авторы раскрашивают себя перед читателями, приписывают себе мнения, каких на самом деле не имеют или не очень их имеют; притворяются равнодушными к тому, что на самом деле горячо любят, и заинтересованными в том, к чему на самом деле равнодушны. И т. д. Но вот посмертно печатаются письма, <...> написанные впопыхах, среди дела, и о которых большую часть автор через полчаса забывает. И в них его личность вдруг встает вся, и притом «как есть».<sup>22</sup>

A writer's 'immortality' is for Rozanov more likely to be guaranteed in his hurried private notes and letters than in all the immensity of his literary efforts and collected works. The most precious secrets of man's existence are represented by what can be revealed in letters. Siniavskii writes that Rozanov's emphasis on his books' manuscript nature gave them the quality of a private correspondence, free from the mass readership:

Книга, отмеченная признаком рукописности, становится чем-то вроде частного письма, адресованного одному человеку. «Опавшие листья» - это совсем не массовое чтение и даже в каком-то смысле не чтение вообще. Это интимная переписка с каким-то другом, с единственным лицом.<sup>23</sup>

Uedinennoe is compiled of notes, that like letters, are not intended for an immediate answering, or for a public crowd,

but for God, or for an unknown, intimate reader. Letters come closest to expressing the whole of man in his need for a self-accounting, from within a specific situation, to another receiving consciousness whose place or judgement is not fixed or definite, not immediate to the situation, in the hope of being understood, perhaps even more fully than one is able to understand oneself at the moment of utterance.<sup>24</sup> They offer a chance for a more authentic self-accounting, because of their privacy and relationship to the reader. In Bakhtinian terms, Rozanov's publication of letters allows for a greater potential life of the word. A letter is written at a precise point in place or time, to an assumed intimate, or sympathetic reader, but it is sent out into an indefinite future and there are many possible readers, interpretations, and no ultimate reader. A letter is a bid for freedom and a fuller understanding in time from the limited confines of our immediate conditions. In a letter to Briusov, Rozanov describes the presence of God as a sort of watchful correspondence: '<...> вообще есть какая-то о нас переписка, мысль, надзор, когда мы ходим и делаем свои дела здесь, в нижнем этаже вселенной.'<sup>25</sup> Rozanov suggests a divine correspondence, describing God as a letter writer, and observant guarantor of human lives. In Pered Sakharnoi, Rozanov described human lives as marked out by written characters that we have a duty to read, and make sense of. He described these as unique to each person: 'В каждом человеке Земля (планета) получает себе подарок. Но «подарок» этот исполнен внутренними письменами. Вот



прочитать-то их и уразуметь и составляет обязанность всякого человека.'<sup>26</sup> It is our duty to read and make sense of these characters in writing, as a sort of answering to the author of these hieroglyphs. Rozanov claimed that this 'book' of one's own life is the only book that is truly open to each person. There is an endless potential for our own readings of the meanings inscribed in our lives. Each person should write their own Uedinennoe in response to the characters which he contains.<sup>27</sup> Thus the publication of Uedinennoe can be seen as Rozanov's answering of this duty towards these 'inner characters'. Rozanov described the feelings that he notes in writing as things that are put aside for the 'store' of eternity: 'Мысли наши, как трава, вырастают и умирают. Но радости и печали суть какие-то отлагания в Склад Вечности. Эти отлагания я и записываю в «Уед.».'<sup>28</sup> It is the chance notings, rather than the contrived authority of printed literature, that have lasting value:

Вечное - в мгновениях. Вечное именно - не века, не времена, не общее, а «сейчас».

Их и записывай, - как самое важное, что вообще увидел в жизни. <...>

(как произошло «Уед.»).<sup>29</sup>

In the opavshie list'ia, Rozanov incorporates not only letters from anonymous and unknown people and the living voices of his friends and family, but also chance handwritten notes and inscriptions that are left on

envelopes and scraps of paper. These were not only his own, specifically intended for his work, but also those of others around him, the written remnants of affection and communication that are the treasured debris of family life. He saw himself almost as a guardian of these other 'hidden' voices that surround us in everyday life but never acquire the authority of print. He values them for their obscurity and ephemeral quality, and yet he claims that he seeks to rescue them from this obscurity by making them 'eternal' in print. For Rozanov, the world exists in as much as it is uttered in the voices of humans as they react to the events of their lives. These voices are like the passage of time, they are constantly new according to the irrepeatable situation in which they are uttered. The attempt to systematize a voice in the form of an 'objective' article and give it a seeming superiority over time, through print, denies this spontaneity and uniqueness.

#### HANDWRITING, MANUSCRIPTS AND PRINTING

Rozanov's concern to produce a book that preserved the spirit of a private correspondence or manuscript was all the more urgent at a time of rapid advance in print technology and the mechanisms of mass publication and distribution. Rozanov had at times a superstitious horror of print. Print and the inventor of the printing press, Gutenberg, are repeatedly attacked by Rozanov, in print, as destructive and supernatural forces of the dark last age.

They destroy the spirit of the letter, leaving only empty words like corpses:

В чем, так сказать, магия книгопечатания, отрицательная магия? Буквы, каждая напечатанная, потеряли лицо свое и с ним душу свою. Буквы стали неодушевленные и все строки неодушевленные, и вся страница, и целая книга. Книга неодушевленная!!! - черт знает что такое. Труп, разложение, вонь. Ибо ведь по содержащейся-то в ней мысли книга есть одушевленное из одушевленного.

И вот это одушевленное из одушевленного передано через машинные знаки. <...> «книгопечатание» убило содержание книг, это пространство духа летящего и трепетание воздуха под крыльями. «По рукописи» я чувствую его, по печати - автора не чувствую.

Магия письма исчезла, книга есть а-магическая рукопись, - рукопись с «убитым в ней духом».

Почерк, каждый, - личен, особенен, не отвлеченен. У Рцы и Флоренского почерк как «паучки бегают по бумаге». У Мордвиновой - как тонкие протянутые паутинки. И смотря на почерки и просто читая письмо, - я не только узнаю мысль передавшую в письме, но я «магируюсь» моим другом, испытываю влияние и от его души, ибо на меня падают тени от его души. <...> Я «в его веянии», а не только «читаю его письмо»: и когда читали без печати Нестора или Виргилия, то Погодин или Строев или Поджио и Филельфо переселялись душой в XI век Русской Истории, в Августовский век Рима.

Теперь мы знаем только наш XIX век. И есть Нестор XIX

века и Виргилий XIX века, - более звуки, чем суть.<sup>30</sup>

Print imposes a uniformity that subsumes all writings to the intellectual voracity of the nineteenth century, which equates the acquiring of knowledge with the accumulating of information. The nineteenth century illusion of all-conquering knowledge sees books as repositories of facts, material for the construction of theories, and for the ambitions of a spirit of learning that believed it could master history through reading. Rozanov believed that it was this faith in the equally objective 'facts' of history, reproduced identically, in print, without any attention to the specific origins of the words in which they are expressed, that led to the uncomprehending and unloving domination of nihilism. Rozanov believed that a manuscript could give a sense of the context in which something was written. He valued the specific character of handwriting styles, like individual vocal intonation, rhythms and styles of speech, as giving access to something that is beyond the factual information of words, that allows an ideal reading that can penetrate the 'soul' of the writer and marks the reader's own soul. Handwriting is expressive of what cannot be said in words, in the way that a person's physical presence would be. Rozanov draws a direct parallel between handwriting and intonation when he wrote that the printed publication of Leont'ev's letters in Russkii vestnik should be accompanied by examples of his handwriting, which conveyed, like his voice, what could not

be told by his printed words:

Нужно бы приложить снимки с почерка его, - этого женского почерка, с едва выраженным нажимом пера <...> с тонкими, почти острыми загибами букв, с подчеркиваниями слов или иногда в слове только слогов, которые будто слышались, как произносит он резким, отрывающим голосом <...>. Этот почерк был очень похож на стиль его (каллиграфически изображал его), нервный и острый, страстный и мучительный...<sup>31</sup>

The moral consequences of the printing press and the value of writing by hand was a theme that had been written about extensively by the religious thinker and contemporary of Rozanov, Nikolai Fedorov. Fedorov similarly saw handwriting as a revealing touchstone of the spirit in which an idea is written, more revealing than the word, which, especially in print, can have meanings that are misleading and ambiguous:

<...> письма суть только графическое изображение прогресса того существа, которое одарено словом, словесного существа (потому-то палеография, эта скромная наука, и может быть обличительницей гордого прогресса). Занимаясь формами букв, <...> эта наука пользуется большим презрением у некоторых прогрессистов, а между тем формы букв говорят гораздо более слов, говорят искреннее их, формы букв неподкупнее слов; скоропись, например, на словах говорит о прогрессе, а формы букв, как увидим, свидетельствует о регрессе.<sup>32</sup>

Fedorov praised the study of paleography as a weapon against the proud assertions of progress. Rozanov describes the science of paleography in terms that would have been pleasing to Fedorov, as almost a resurrection of lives, in a review of a book by Barsukov:

Если есть вид литературы, который всегда безгрешен и иногда свят, - то это палеография. Что такое палеография? - Собрание старых писем, никому (лично) не нужных - все равно XII-го или XIX-го века; <...> Вы умерли; казалось - вы никому не нужны. И вот, когда вы забыты всем миром и, так сказать, испытываете пустыню небытия <...> вы вдруг среди ледяного небытия согреваетесь человеческою теплотою, и для вас начинается еще вторая, удивительно интимная и милая жизнь. Грустно, что операции этой подвергаются только писатели: следовало бы каждому человеку иметь для себя подобного копуна. Что-то египетское, какая-то вечность.<sup>33</sup>

This passage emphasizes the value of a watchfulness over our fellow human beings. Private writings are a symbol of this watchfulness, the vestiges of what is eternal in each man's life. These diaries and letters, and the watching guardianship of those that read them, however far in the future, represent a reserve of the warmth and intimacy that is the source of all life. The 'glacial non-being' of death is a phrase that Rozanov used frequently to describe the state of contemporary life and literature. Rozanov wanted

to counteract this imminent new ice age with the 'human warmth' that was contained in these handwritten documents. Rozanov emphasizes the generosity and lack of egotism of Barsukov, who has collected these writings and refuses to impose his own 'writerly' presence on what he presents, a quality that Rozanov felt was absent in almost all contemporary writing. The personal and hidden vestiges of people's lives are presented without the author adding anything of himself:

Эта всюду увядающая любовь, в ее ненужных, не утилитарных целях, светится из каждой строки этого замечательного писателя, этого египтянина, <...> редко он от себя и сейчас что-нибудь рассказывает: он благоговейно молчит и подает вам лоскуток бумаги, какую-нибудь записочку, письмо, дневник с полинявшими чернилами, где о великом или любимом человеке вы читаете несколько строк. <...> и не представляя вовсе систематической биографии (самый скверный и лживый род литературы), этот клочок бумаги дает вам вдруг почувствовать еще живую и теплую руку умершего давно человека.<sup>34</sup>

Fedorov wrote that handwriting maintained a link with the 'spirit' of the original expression, as in the gothic writing of medieval manuscripts. This writing was performed like a prayer. He claimed that the writing of modern times expresses the essence of its age by its main characteristics, convenience and speed: 'Скоропись (курсив,

мелкое, беглое письмо, беглопись) это письмо нового времени, переходящего от религиозной жизни к светской.'<sup>35</sup> Ironically, this description could apply to Rozanov's own handwriting ('курсив, мелкое, беглое письмо') and even his stylistic simulation of handwriting, his attempt to convey a 'manuscript' in print. Indeed Rozanov's love of handwriting for its expression of individual 'style' and character, and the hurried, fragmentary and scrawling character of his own handwriting, a characteristic that he claimed to preserve in print, were in direct contrast to the values that Fedorov was defending in his praise of the medieval manuscripts. Siniavskii emphasized these characteristics of Rozanov's transformative 'manuscript':

В результате от печатного текста остается впечатление какой-то скорописи, небрежных и беглых заметок, рукописного черновика. Все это внешнее оформление работает на девиз: «Почти на праве рукописи».

Видимая рукописность издания сообщает ему большую интимность <...>. В этом смысле рукописность стиля есть особый род литературной коммуникации и особый способ существования и бытования книги.<sup>36</sup>

Rozanov claimed that this 'manuscript style' was turning literature back to its origins as a private and sacred task. He writes of the achievement of Uedinennoe: 'Новое - тон, опять - манускриптов, «до Гутенберга», для себя.' [Q. 1. I: 249] Yet his exploitation of the manuscript was



innovative and significantly different from the manuscripts that Fedorov idealizes. Rozanov wanted to use the manuscript to exploit the potentials of print. He claimed that in this way he would overcome its power, as in V Sakharne where he defends his right to publish his wife's intimate note to her masseuse:

И как я люблю копаться в этих бумажках, откуда «доброе движение моей Вари к массажистке», никогда не умрет (теперь) через Гуттенберга.. - которым, пожалуй, только не умели воспользоваться. Нужно рукописно пользоваться печатью, - и тогда она «ничего себе», «кой-чему служит».<sup>37</sup>

Rozanov believed that the emotional energy of an individual human life, that which gave writing its 'eternal' value, was contained in literature's private and handwritten forms. He wanted to convey this in print. He feared that writers were themselves losing their distinctive qualities with the depersonalizing reproduction of their work in print:

Как будто этот проклятый Гуттенберг облизал своим медным языком всех писателей, и они все обездушились «в печати», потеряли лицо, характер. Мое «я» только в рукописях, да «я» и всякого писателя. Должно быть по этой причине я питаю суеверный страх рвать письма, тетради (даже детские), рукописи, - и ничего не рву; сохранил, до единого, все письма товарищей-гимназистов; с жалостью, за

величиной вороха, рву только свое, - с болью и лишь иногда.

[Ued.: 39]

Rozanov equated the loss of this individual energy in writing with its mechanical means of production. In an article for the first number of the journal Letopisets, published by his friend and colleague Ivan Romanov (Rtsy), Rozanov makes a description of the machine printing of cloth an image of the detrimental effects of printing machines and mechanization in general in contemporary Russia:

«Кубовья» эти материи чаще и чаще приходят мне на ум, когда я беру, для очищения совести, журнал, газету, а очень часто даже и книгу <...>.

<...> Никакой разницы в производстве. Тоже берется какой-то механизм, приблизительно доска, и прикладывается к бумаге так, к бумаге этак: и вышло - «сочинение». Что-то подобное есть. <...> в самом деле выходит, чорт возьми, книга, с оглавлением, предисловием, даже с примечаниями и, следовательно, эрудицией. <...>

Я хочу этой шуткой сказать необыкновенно грустную мысль, что от усталости ли человеческой, от множества ли печати, или во исполнение магического слова, перенесенного на землю некогда: «к концу времен - охладет в людях любовь» (энтузиазм, всяческий порыв): но менее и менее становится видно в литературе личности человеческой. Точно пишет «вообще человек», «куб», а не Иван Иванович, человек

таких-то манер и характера <...>. Душа скрылась из литературы; и работают какие-то «общие способности». Все индивидуальное, «мое», «не чужое» - меркнет! неудержимо!! ....Посмотрите, как притупилось в каждом зрение, наблюдательность; даже интерес смотреть, взглянуть!<sup>38</sup>

In this short article, Rozanov summarizes the main causes of his hostility towards print. He blames the printing press for the depersonalization of writing, the loss of individual character (lichnost'), that should be manifest in all good writing. A book or article is no longer the expression of a unique spirit and inspiration but has become a mechanical product of a mechanized age, indifferent to its own conception. Print, and the products of the printing press, are seen here, and repeatedly elsewhere, as agents of the 'planetary cooling', the freezing up and distancing of relations between people that Rozanov saw as symptomatic of modernity, a mechanized civilization, and as an anticipation of the last days, as described in the Biblical Apocalypse.

Fedorov associated the modern degeneration of handwriting into print with all forms of speed in the mechanization of contemporary life. He linked high-speed rifles with high-speed printing presses:

В названии письма нового времени «скорѣм», которое (т.е. «скорое») прилагается и к ружьям - к скорострельным - и к скоропечатным станкам, может быть прилагается и к средствам

сообщения - скороходным, скоровозным, - в этом названии схвачена самая существенная черта, или свойство нового времени, ибо в понятии прогресса заключается не понятие просто изменения, просто движения, но движения постоянно ускоряемого.<sup>39</sup>

Rozanov also linked the lead of the printing press with the lead of bullets. High speed printing presses are an illusory power, that people mistakenly believe will confer on them an heroic grandeur, irrespective of their thoughts:

- Байрон был свободен, - неужели же не буду свободен я?! - кричал Арцыбашев.

- Ибо ведь я печатаюсь теми же свинцовыми буквами!

Да, в свинцовых буквах все и дело. Отвоевали свободу не душе, не уму, но свинцу.

Но ведь, господа, может придти некто, кто скажет:

- Свинцовые пули. И даже с Гуттенберговой литерой N(apoleon)... - как видел я это огромное N на французских пушках вокруг Арсенала в Москве.

[O. 1. II: 369]

Rozanov also recognized speed of communication as one of the most powerful aspects of contemporary life. He described the immense impact of the railways in furthering the power of print:<sup>40</sup>

Да, - железные дороги просто тем, что они провелись и через

них все уторопилось, ускорилося, имели более умственного и вообще психологического действия на людей, на города, на страны, чем напр. у нас «Современник» со всеми Скабическими. «Железная дорога от Москвы до Петербурга» есть более литературный факт, нежели основание «Вестника Европы» или закрытие «Отечественных Записок». Сам Стасюлевич есть только «приложение» к железной дороге <...>. Вот кто победил и кафедралы, и пап, и Лойолу, и победил Руссо и его мечтательную, волшебную эпоху! «Не надо! Не надо ничего!! Отвертывай свисток!!..» И свисток гулко разнесся по обоим полушарям.

[Lit. izg.: 309-10, n.1]

The train, like the printing press, helps to hasten the word out of its spoken, intimate context into a mass impersonal audience and a false 'objectivity' and authority. The distancing effect of these mechanical innovations on the word spreads throughout society, since it is the activity of the word that is the gauge of the life of a society.

Rozanov blamed print for the loss of the essential spirit of literature, which lies in its spoken, and then handwritten, expression. Writing's origin is with the warmth of the breath, and not the cold indifference of print. It is bound closely to the human body and its instincts, resisting the false objectification imposed by the printing machines. It is these instinctive utterances that, Rozanov believes, show the original movement of mind,

which is sacred and worth writing down:

Всякое движение души у меня сопровождается выговариванием. И всякое выговаривание я хочу непременно записать. Это - инстинкт. Не из такого ли инстинкта родилась литература (письменная)? Потому что о печати не приходит мысль; и следовательно, Гутенберг пришел совсем «потом».

У нас литература так слилась с печатью, что мы совсем забываем, что она была до печати и, в сущности, вовсе не для опубликования. Литература родилась «про себя» (молча) и для себя; и уже потом стала печататься. Но это - одна техника.

[Ued.: 72]

Despite repeatedly declaring the superiority of spontaneous, spoken and privately written words, Rozanov could not resist the temptations of mass publication. His bid at making a printed manuscript was a triumphant exploitation of the possibilities of print, and he was well aware of his literary innovation. Rozanov saw himself as a literary phenomenon, exploiting print against the prejudices of its nature, which he claimed lay in generalization and objectification, and using it to set down the most specific, intimate and trivial details, but emphatically in print, and for mass publication. Rozanov published his first collection of thoughts and notings,

Uedinennoe, with the subtitle 'почти на праве рукописи'. As Siniavskii has shown, he was asserting the role of a manuscript, in the same way that he asserted his right not to address or write for the reader but simply to publish his private conversation with himself, which would be sold to a mass public. The seeming contrariness was actually a furthering of the principled intimacy, by which Rozanov sought to counteract a process of freezing up in society that was a result of increasing mechanization. Siniavskii emphasizes the paradoxical nature of Rozanov's relationship with printed words and emphasizes the contrasts of warmth and cold that were so important for Rozanov's explanation of his task:

С одной стороны, Розанов поносит литературу, печать, книгу, Гуттенберга. А с другой, он тащит в печать то, что печатать было не принято. То есть, это и крайнее отрицание и апофеоз печатного слова. Розанов намерен преодолеть литературу своей рукописностью, литературу вообще, которая для него в данном случае синоним искусственности и человеческой отчужденности. Тогда как его рукописность - это синоним естественности и межчеловеческой близости, тепла.<sup>41</sup>

A manuscript eschews the profanation that a printed document suffers at the hands of the anonymous mass of indifferent readers. Rozanov hoped that he could also achieve this in his printed 'manuscript'. He recognized that the printing press was inescapable, and argued that

the real threat lay in man's perception of printed words. He sought to subvert these perceptions by publishing a printed document as though it were a manuscript, and by including material that would have been conventionally perceived as unprintable. He also includes his own polemics with the press alongside intimate and conventionally unprintable details.

In a letter to Leont'ev Rozanov described a moral revulsion that he felt when seeing his handwritten thoughts in print. He describes print and publication as a profanation of the most intimate and sacred expressions of man's existence: 'есть нечто развратное в писательстве; я это вечно чувствую, и когда вижу свои мысли напечатанными, у меня пробуждается чувство мучительного неудовлетворения.'<sup>42</sup> Rozanov sought to counteract this sense by asserting the private and intimate nature of a manuscript form, suggesting that his writing is for an intimate correspondent, an unknown intimate or for himself. It is an attempt to reject formally the proud claims of print, while exploiting its aura and its mass distribution to convey the message of intimacy, private life and thoughts, as well as his own political polemics, as widely as possible. Rozanov equates his printed 'manuscript' with a printed 'nakedness', that only he is capable of carrying out in publication:

Таким образом, «рукописность» души, врожденная и неодолимая, отнюдь не своевольная и не приобретенная, и



дала мне тон «Y.», я думаю, совершенно новый за все века книгопечатания. Можно рассказать о себе очень позорные вещи - и все-таки рассказанное будет «печатным» <...>. Предстояло устранить это опубликование. И я, который наименее опубликовался уже в печати, сделал еще шаг внутрь, спустился еще на ступень вниз против своей обычной «печати» <...> и очутился, «как в бане нагишом», что мне не было вовсе трудно. Только мне и одному мне.

[Q. 1. I: 250]

In Posle Sakharny, Rozanov asserts a principled intimacy. He describes his writing as going naked and baring all before his public, in order to counteract the influence of the printing press on contemporary life, to force people to realize the artificial distance that print has enforced:

Отчего я так волнуюсь от литературы (антипатия). Тут есть что-то особенное. Не только во мне, но и в звездах (судьба, история). Даже может быть, чего я сам не понимаю? Не это ли: что литература есть недостаточная форма общения между людьми... слишком далекая, слишком формальная, слишком холодная?

Люди должны ближе стать друг к другу. Не «от читателя к читателю», что слишком отвлеченно и далеко, а тереться плечом, соработать, видеться, общаться.

<...>

Люди должны дотрагиваться друг к другу - вот моя мысль.

Гутенберг уничтожил всеобщую потребность дотрагиваться. Стали дотрагиваться в «трубу», «через телефон» (книга): вот злая черная точка в Гутенберге.

Гутенберг один принес более смерти на Землю, чем все люди до него. С него-то и началось замораживание (планеты). Исчезли милые дотрагивания.<sup>43</sup>

Rozanov's intimacy in writing was an attempt to counteract the coldness and distance between people that he claims has been brought to society by print, by exploiting the vehicle of print. In his Mimoletnoe of 1915, Rozanov examines the reasons for the contradictions of his writing, of his attempt to combine the opposite extremes of the living soul and the destructive technology of print:

Я «издаю свою душу», как Гершензон «издавал Пушкина», с тем же безучастием, объективностью и библиографичностью.

Как страшно: душу, живую, горячую, - прилагаю к холодному типографическому станку.

Холодно душе. А станку «ничего».

Зачем я это делаю и даже как это вообще возможно?

Я думаю одолеть литературу (моя мечта). Не душа моя похолодеет от печати, но «свинцовый ряд»... его не будет (растопится).

Опять рукописи... желтенькие, старые.

Как бы хорошо.

Опять свободный человек: свободный от ЧУДОВИЩНОГО РАБСТВА книгам.

О, какое это рабство... унижительное, гнетущее; всеразрушающее (культуру).<sup>44</sup>

Rozanov describes his aim as a transcendence of literature in its contemporary printed form.<sup>45</sup> The proliferation of bookprinting and literary journals was enslaving people's minds and spontaneous reaction to life. Books were potentially extremely dangerous, as they infused men with false authorities and weakened their instinctive reactions. Rozanov claimed that his own material was so raw that it could not be deadened by print.

#### THE PRESS

Despite his attacks on literature, Rozanov had a deep love for books. It was the mass publication of journals and newspapers that was the true threat. Rozanov attacked the contemporary desire for publication in his article on the decadents.<sup>46</sup> Modernity is marked by the need to assert oneself noisily in print for a wide audience despite the poverty of the actual thought. Rozanov believed that the influence of literary journals helped to promote the noisy literary market-place over quiet conversations in the study. The influence of words could now be made at immense speed and over a vast scale. Yet the authority of the literary journals was illusory, a power of inspiring reverence and fear that would vanish as soon as people learnt to treat them with the contempt they deserved:

Литература (печать) прищемила у человека самолюбие. Все стали бояться ее; все стали ждать от нее... «Эти мошенники, однако, раздают монтюоновские премии». И вот откуда выросла ее сила.

Сила ее оканчивается там, где человек смежает на нее глаза. «Шестая держава» (Наполеон о печати) обращается вдруг в посеревшую хилую деревушку, как только, повернувшись к ней спиной, вы смотрите на дело, а не на ландкарту с надписью: «Шестая держава».

[О. 1. I: 194]

Rozanov's attack on the printing press is closely linked to his attack on contemporary journals and journalists, both are referred to as 'pechat'. The journals are, far more than books, products of the modern printing press, and they are responsible for the degeneration in the use of the word in contemporary life. Rozanov believed that Russian journalism abused the immense power it had over people's thoughts and literary judgement. Their influence on popular taste was such that many truly original talents were unread and unpublished, while banal and second-rate writers achieved immense success by adopting fashionable literary and political poses. These journals, Rozanov wrote, attracted opportunists who merely wanted to make their name, and so encouraged further the detriment to the reading public:

Серия журналов и газет ищут и жадно рвут каждую радикальную статью <...>. Этот-то успех, заранее обеспеченный, создавал тон полной веры в себя у «стучащегося в дверь литературы», и смелое, открытое, зовущее открывание ему двери «оттуда». Так начались все литературные карьеры первых, вторых и третьих талантов, работавших в западническом и по преимуществу в радикальных и социалистических журналах <...>. Там - свет, там - солнце, там - успех, ибо там разрушалась историческая Россия, <...> с ее православием и народностью.

[Lit. izq.: 271, n.1]

A constant complaint in Rozanov's articles, letters and footnotes to the published editions of Literaturnye izgnanniki is the success and opulence of these untalented liberal and so-called radical journalists. The liberal journals had far greater circulations than the more nationalist and conservative publications, except for Suvorin's Novoe vremia. Rozanov claimed that the government and state censorship were so in awe of this power that they effectively submitted to them, and even gave support. Thus writers who posed as men of the people were actually deeply compromised with the existing order, while would-be defenders of Tsarist values, the Church and tradition, writers like Strakhov and Govorukha-Otrok, were the true radicals, isolated, impoverished, struggling to place articles that Rozanov believed were the life-blood of Russian culture, yet unread by the people and even

persecuted by the censorship. Rozanov was outraged that the government could intentionally ignore and even outmanoeuvre writers who would have been of the greatest value to the Tsar and the Church, as they defended the very traditions of religion and Russianness that these authorities supposedly represented. Meanwhile, the so-called 'liberal' and 'radical' writers benefited from their glamorous reputation as daring fighters for a popular cause from a position of security and prosperity, and with the tacit support of the established order. In a letter written to the editor Pertsov in 1896, Rozanov attacks the undeclared collusion of liberal journalism and government:

Вы не знаете этого ужаса, что Россия <...> имеет изменическое правительство, и когда мы кричим «caveat cons.», мы кричим народу о его прав[ительстве]. Просто вы не знаете фактов, не знаете действительности. «Рус<ские> Вед<омости>» - в ближайшей связи стоят к Мин<истерству> внутр<енних> дел и непосредственно с ним сносятся <...> а между тем постоянно делают вид <...> что они стоят в оппозиции к правительству, ибо только при этом условии в нашем тупом обществе можно иметь успех. <...> те мерзавцы (либералы), <...> угодничают перед лицами, т. е. именно играют на струнке собственной, правительственной измены и достигают цели.

<...> печать наша подлая обманывает общество и уж конечно не повинуется народному духу. Не могу без мучения просто думать об этом.<sup>47</sup>

Rozanov claimed that the government was flawed by the same weaknesses as the press, sacrificing energy and initiative to a mediocre uniformity, motivated by envy and petty pride. He claimed that parliament had become a 'journalist': 'Это нелепое и чудовищное явление, вполне гадкое и в гуттенберговском наборе, стало еще гаже, обсуждая «законы».' [Q. 1. II: 528]. The state censorship is also implicated in the conspiracy against the national interest. Rozanov claims that the government lacks any coherent censorship policy except for the actions prompted by bribery from prominent members of the liberal establishment:

Цензор только начинает «понимать», когда его Краевский с Некрасовым кормят обедом. Тогда у него начинается пищеварение, и он догадывается, что «Щедрина надо пропустить».

[Q. 1. II: 336]

Потом эта идиотическая цензура, как кислотой вьедающая «православие, самодержавие и народность» из книг; непропуск моей статьи «О монархии», в параллель с покровительством социал-демократическим «Делу», «Русскому Богатству» etc. Я вдруг опомнился и понял, что идет в России «кутеж и обман», что в ней встала левая «опричнина», завладевшая всею Россией и плещущая купоросом в лицо каждому, кто не примкнет к «оппозиции с семгой», к «оппозиции с шампанским», к «оппозиции с Кутлером на 6-титысячной

пенсии»...

И пошел в ту тихую, бессильную, может быть в самом деле имеющую быть затоптанною оппозицию, которая состоит в:

- 1) помолиться,
- 2) встать рано и работать.<sup>48</sup>

[Q. 1. II: 460]

Rozanov allies himself, in spirit, with the original and conscientious writers who remained in poverty and obscurity. Yet he continued to publish his writing, and his polemics against the print and the press, as widely as possible. Shklovskii noted this incongruity, arguing that Rozanov's stylistic devices were themselves the result of newspaper technology and that half the opavshie list'ia genre was made up of journalistic material.<sup>49</sup> Yet Rozanov repeatedly returned to his battle with the journals in the opavshie list'ia genre and in his footnotes in Literaturnye izgnanniki. He characterized the world of the printed journals by their noisy vanity: 'Так один около одного болтается: Горнфельд трется о спину Короленки <...>. Выходит шум, большею частью, «взаимных симпатий» и обоедного удивления таланту. Но почему этот «шум литературы» Россия должна принимать за «свой прогресс»?'

[Q. 1. II: 454] Rozanov also attacked the 'tone' of contemporary journalism that had corrupted its readers:

Этот гнусный тон, от Чернышевского до Михайловского, тон всеядного кабака и захватистого дома терпимости <...> стоял



50 лет в нашей журналистике, <...> и развратил читателя, развратил публику, сгустив тот цинизм с которым «нет sprawy никому».

[Lit. izq.: 250, n.1]

Rozanov was particularly repelled by what he saw as the encouragement of negation by the radical journals. Rozanov saw the popularity of critical articles as a consequence of print and mass circulation, and it fuelled his enmity towards these technological innovations. He believed that this attitude was not limited to journalism, but extended to literature and books. Writers who wrote words in 'love and respect' are ignored. Their words might never have been written. In a letter of 1911 to Izmailov, Rozanov cites this as fuelling his battle with existing literature:

В течение вот уже долгой литературной деятельности я замечал не только часто, но постоянно, что как только в печати скажешь что-нибудь насмешливое, презирающее, негодующее и, словом, скажешь к разрушению - так это всеми, всею печатью, <...> хвалится и, в конце концов, действует... Если же что-нибудь скажешь с любовью, с уважением и, словом, - к созиданию, то как бы это ни было сказано - это не получает никакого значения, силы, не помнится, не читается, не запоминается, не нужно. И, видя это, - я возненавидел литературу. Печально с этим жить и еще печальнее умирать.<sup>50</sup>

Rozanov warns against the seductive appeal of a cynical and mocking attitude. He argues that the qualities which attract readers are not ones that will give them lasting rewards or richness from their reading. Satire and negation have a superficial piquancy, that inspire insignificant writers and readers to feel superior in their mockery. The very titles of the journals lure their public with promise of negation:

Посмотрите названия журналов: «Тарантул», «Оса». Целое издательство - «Скорпион». Еще какое-то среднеазиатское насекомое (был журнал). «Шиповник».

И все «жалят» Россию. «Как бы и куда ей запустить яда».

Дивиться ли, что она взбесилась.

\*\*\*

И вот простая «История русского нигилизма».

[O. 1. II: 422]

Rozanov held the radical and westernizing journals responsible for forming the negative and superficial outlook of the Russian intelligentsia: 'Вообще «Вестн. Евр.», за 43 года многописания, сыграл колоссальную роль в установке шаблонного типа «русского интеллигентного человека»'. [Lit. izq.: 225-26, n.2] These readers from the 'intelligentsia' are attracted by the rebellious bravura and the heroic combative role described for them in the phrases of newspaper and journal articles, that they can

experience vicariously, from the safety of their armchairs. Rozanov claimed that it was easy for a civil-servant to imagine himself as a revolutionary hero, without excessive martyrdom. It was enough to read Otechestvennye zapiski, Russkoe bogatstvo or Delo and wait. The tone of condemnation and sarcastic ridicule of the papers gave them a sense of superiority, achieved by risking no more than the purchase of a paper, which is itself supported by the state. As Andrei Belyi similarly suggested in 1909, this all contributed to the self-satisfaction of the average reader: 'интеллигент читает газеты и умиляется: в таком ангелоподобном виде он там изображен: он - вершина Истории, спасатель России, мерило всех эстетических и умственных ценностей'.<sup>51</sup>

The only successful figure in journalism who is redeemed from the general condemnation was the publisher and editor of the highly popular, although conservative, Novoe vremia, Aleksei Suvorin. Rozanov published Suvorin's letters to him, together with his own memoir of the man, in 1913.<sup>52</sup> He depicted Suvorin as a modern apostle of moral probity at a time when prophecy and preaching could no longer be heard amid the noisy proliferation of printed voices. Suvorin recognized that it was necessary to respond to the new power of the press over the public, but exploited the very noise and 'printed narcotics' for the furthering of his own ends. Rozanov describes how Suvorin promoted the writers that he believed were most needed by Russia, motivated by love and anxiety for the Russian

people. He argued that Suvorin thus achieved more than the Apostle Paul, for in an age where prophecy was no longer possible he made use of the press to convey his message of the renewing power of the word. He sees this demonstrated by Suvorin's successful publication of cheap editions of Pushkin for mass readership, financed by the profits of Novoe vremia:

<...> Суворин, в обширном и спокойном уме все понимая, все видя, - призвал в помощь и этот шум, и эту печатную наркотику. В XIX-м веке он действовал как в XIX-м веке. <...> нужно было в эту-то толпу уже падших людей «капнуть Пушкина». Суворин капнул и капля растворилась в толпе и своей пахучестью хоть несколько облаговонила людей.

Этого не мог сделать апостол Павел: но «хитроумный Улисс» это сделать мог.<sup>53</sup>

The liberal and radical activists were far more cynical about the motivation behind Suvorin's sensitivity to the mood of the time. In 1901, Lenin claimed that Novoe vremia lacked any consistency in its political opinions but was merely skilled 'in conniving with the mood and tone of the moment..and playing on a semblance of popular opinion'.<sup>54</sup> In 1912 he called the journal 'the classic example of a compromised newspaper'.<sup>55</sup> Maksim Gor'kii had written to Rozanov in 1905, urging him to leave Novoe vremia, arguing that it was a corrupt environment whose interests were detrimental to those of Russia: 'Из «Нового

времени» вы бы ушли. Поганное место. Сколько грязи ядовитой излилось и льется оттуда в нашу русскую жизнь.'<sup>56</sup> Rozanov claimed to Gor'kii that he had tried to leave the paper out of political conviction but had been prevented by his loyalty to Suvorin:

Где я ни писал ( «Моск. Вед.», « Русск. Вестник», «Русск. Обзор.», «Нов. Вр.»; только условно и частью любил «Нов. Путь»), я решительно ненавидел и презирал те журналы, в которых писал и редактора и всех сотрудников, буквально сытых и подсмеивающихся. Из «Н. Вр.» я порывался выйти, особенно когда наступили «события». Там меня связывает только сам Суворин <...> Он <...> абсолютно ничего не понимает в движении, «не может поверить» ничему, хоть я и говорю ему. Для него все это «жиды, негодяи и властолюбцы». И именно он мечте-то не верит.<sup>57</sup>

This letter is at odds with the later views expressed in Opavshie list'ia and in footnotes to Literaturnye izgnanniki, on the scourge of the radical press. Yet even during his flirtation with radicalism at the time of the 1905 revolution, Rozanov remained loyal to Suvorin and Novoe vremia. His work for Novoe vremia was a far more essential part of his writing career than he let Gor'kii know. It was precisely the lure of the vast and socially varied mass readership that attracted Rozanov, the possibilities of performing a sort of contemporary prophecy, as he describes in his essay on Suvorin in 1913.

This prophecy was achieved by the agency of the very inventions that Rozanov had claimed were ruining the popular reception of the word, through print, and the mass circulation of the press. The despised print and journals were in fact indispensable to him in this task.

Rozanov's political inclinations became increasingly conservative after the 1905 revolution. Although he continued to write for more liberal journals such as Russkoe slovo, until he was asked to stop contributing in 1911,<sup>58</sup> his writing repeatedly defended Russian traditions, the Russian people, their religion, and the Tsar. He attacked what he described in increasingly extreme language as the liberal-Jewish conspiracy in the press, which he claimed was sucking the life-blood out of Russia, intellectually and financially.<sup>59</sup> He uses the memoir on Suvorin to argue his continual theme, the ravaging and destruction of Russia at the hands of the liberal press. Suvorin is portrayed as a martyr of the Russian people, Russian culture and its sacred tradition:

Раны Суворина - раны телохранителя России.<sup>60</sup>

(Он) <...> служит Неведомому Богу, который конкретно перед ним мелькает как Родина, Земля, Суэта (даже).<sup>61</sup>

Rozanov claimed that Novoe vremia did not seek an easy popularity by adopting fashionable political stances but was concerned above all with Russia's immediate needs. He

compared its verbal response to the urgency of the historical moment to the actions of prophecy. Rozanov believed that words on the pages of Novoe vremia could acquire an almost prophetic status, and thus transcend their origins, in print and the press. He underlines the particular significance of the newspaper:

Значение это: 1) обширнейший круг читателей, вся образованная Россия, 2) возможность этой «всей России» сказать ценное, исторически значащее слово <...>.

Ничего - специального, ничего - частного, ничего - личного, ничего - особенного и партийного; вся - для всей России, для «Целой России», обобщенно - что «требуется народу и государству», требуется «русской истории, как она сейчас живо совершается»: вот лозунг и молчаливо принятый всеми сотрудниками маршрут.<sup>62</sup>

This defence of Novoe vremia in terms of Russian spiritual tradition could also be read as an artful way of concealing what could otherwise be interpreted as a characteristically duplicitous position. Opavshie list'ia was published in 1913, and contained repeated attacks on contemporary journalism and the press. Even Blok praised Rozanov's remarks on the press. His eulogy of Suvorin, published in the same year, had to distinguish the work of Novoe vremia, whose mass appeal was a prime example of the power of the technological innovations, as something significantly different. Rozanov presented it as a triumph over

technology, a return to the prophetic and sacred traditions of the word in the only medium possible in modern times. There is a degree of archness in Rozanov's characterization of Suvorin in religious terms, for he knew him to be a worldly, cunning and establishment newspaper editor. Thus his 'unknown God' includes 'vanity' or gossip ('sueta') in its trinity. The paper's wide circulation attracted writers of all political tendencies, including those who saw themselves as radical, but who, like Rozanov, could not resist the potential audience. Rozanov argued that this was because it was the only medium where words could have practical effect in Russian life, in contrast to the sterile phrases of the liberal newspapers:

А так как «Новое Время» «всеми читается», - <...> «всёю Россиею в деле», то мне опять же известно, до какой степени серьёзнейшими людьми, людьми огромного и теоретического, и практического значения, искалось сказать свое слово со столбцов именно «Нового Времени».<sup>63</sup>

Rozanov claimed that it was the only newspaper that represented truly 'Russian interests', which was the cause of its success: 'в России рассматривали, и давно рассматривали, что это есть единственная газета собственно русская'.<sup>64</sup> In Posle Sakharny, Rozanov describes the colossal impact of Novoe vremia in Russian society, which relegates the rest of the press to a chimera, ironically, to the 'writing for oneself', by which Rozanov had earlier



declared that he would overcome the effects of print on literature:

<...> все читают, все внимают, вся Россия слушает каждое мое слово, всякую мою мысль <...>. Это «открытие книгопечатания». <...> Нов. Вр., достигнув <...> колоссальной преимущественности, как бы всех «их», всю печать - спустила в какой-то погреб небытия, <...> и писания для себя.<...> Это почти «безумное» положение вещей, может быть, почти «преступное», - коего как-то сумел достигнуть старик Суворин, <...> и может быть, не бывало в мире печати.<sup>65</sup>

Rozanov believed that the newspaper had miraculously rekindled an enthusiasm in its readers, a hunger for the word, that had been lost in the proliferation of print. In an article of 1916 on the censorship, Rozanov again expresses awe for the immense potential of print technology, if it is used to promote literature in its true and original sense. If used in the right spirit, the new technology could produce a mass intimate communication of private thoughts and dreams that, instead of distancing people, would bring them nearer than they could have ever imagined:

Все, кто говорит об абсолютной свободе литературы, имеют в виду ее невинное рождение, и вовсе как будто не замечают ее последующей истории. А «рождение»-то ее прекрасно, как

рождение младенца: эти мудрые люди, или люди с особенным талантом, <...> с «даром Божиим» кладут на бумагу таинственным образом вырастающие у них мысли, фантазии, <...> «идеалы», улучшенное, облитое мечтой и воображением... И через чудо техники, печать, назавтра становится это всем известно, все читают, думают о том же, мысленно спорят, мысленно благодарят. Все это похоже на волшебство, - <...> о котором, казалось бы, можно было мечтать только в золотом веке. И вот - она осуществилась.<sup>66</sup>

Despite his pessimism about print, and the effects that it had had, through the detrimental influence of the journals, on literature, and despite his protests that life was becoming eaten up by print, and replaced by a ghostly and unspontaneous 'literary' existence, Rozanov maintained a deep love for literature. He frequently returns to a faith in literature and books. He believed that society produces literature as its natural fruit: 'Ведь в сокровенной сущности вещей все общество рождает из себя литературу.'<sup>67</sup> Thus it was all the more important to cultivate its source with care. In a letter to Suvorin, Rozanov expresses his faith in Russian literature:

Русскую литературу, при всех ее «текущих недостатках», я очень люблю. В разные времена жизни я верил или пытался верить в разные стороны нашей жизни: а кончил, казалось бы, самой вулгарной верой - в литературу. Главное тут меня трогает ее старательность: чего-чего она не видит, о чем

только - не заботится? Это в сущности превосходный штат не нанятых чиновников.<sup>68</sup>

In Opavshie list'ia, Rozanov contends that literature could be restored to its original strength if it could be freed from the seductions of vanity and arrogance, which he believes are largely the fault of the press's influence:

Вообще литература, конечно, дрянь (мнение и Фл.), - но и здесь «не презирай никакого состояния в мире», и ты иногда усмотришь нечто прекрасное.

<...>

И я думаю, что как полное ремесло, сапожное ремесло - литература имеет в себе качества и достоинство, и вообще человеческое в ней не утратилось....

<...> Настоящего литератора закрыла от нас действительно хлестаковская мантия столичного фельетониста или самоупоенного передовика <...>. Есть доброе, и сильное и честное в литературе; есть (нужда) бесконечно в ней страдающее. Такой литератор - народный учитель, т.е. то же, что труженик сельской или городской школы.

И поклонимся ему... Не все цинично на Руси. И не все цинично в литературе.

[Q. 1. I: 326-28]

Passages such as these are marked by a nostalgia for an imagined innocence of rural life that Rozanov knew from his own experience was not entirely true. In a turnabout from

his attack on books, his contempt for a simplistic moralizing or educative role for literature, Rozanov continues in this mood of imagined innocence, envisaging a literary transformation of the Russian people: 'Литература собственно есть естественная школа народа, и она может быть единственной и достаточной школой... Но, конечно, при условии, что весь народ читает Войну и Мир, а Мальву и Трое Горького читают только специалисты-любители.' [O. 1. II: 339] Rozanov claimed that writers could enter into the lifeblood of their readers and so transform them. He frequently used images of physical consumption to describe the effect that writers had on him. The writers that most deeply affect him are the ones that he digests fully, and who become a part of his constitution, for example, Pushkin: 'Пушкин... я его ел. Уже знаешь страницу, сцену; и перечтешь вновь: но это - еда. Вошло в меня, бежит в крови, освежает мозг, чистит душу от грехов.' [Smert.: 136]<sup>69</sup> He described his own aims in literature similarly, as the possibility of effecting an internal transformation of the reader's most intimate thoughts and feelings. The invention of print and the increase in literacy meant that this individual, internal transformation could be achieved on a scale previously undreamed of. Despite his public condemnations of the abuse of these innovations, Rozanov found this opportunity for mass intimacy irresistible:

Действительно: есть писатели, которые входят в плоть и кровь общества, страны; и есть писатели для полок

библиотек. 99% литературы существует для библиотек. Существование скучное, тусклое, печальное. Невозможно и представить себе, что значит «входить в жилы» общества, чувствовать, что ты перерабатываешь дух людей, быт людей. Это - особая психология, головокружительная.<sup>70</sup>

Rozanov's ideal would be to use the potential of print to activate the 'flesh and blood' of his readers in this way. Literature could once again become a vital part of people's lives. The word would regain life as language opened up to real experience once more. He argued that this could be achieved by abolishing newspapers and returning people's concentration to their own lives and thoughts, the true origin of literature. Indeed he believed that the press was already losing its power over people's minds:

Вся та энергишка, которую - тоже издробленную уже - суют авторы в газеты, в ненужные передовицы, в увядшие фельетоны  
<...>

Все эти люди, такие несчастные сейчас, вернулись бы к покою, счастью и достоинству.

Число книг сразу удесятирилось бы...

Все отрасли знания возросли бы...

Стали бы лучше писать. Появился бы стиль.

<...>

Буди! буди!

\*\*\*

А читателю - какой выигрыш: с утра он принимается за

дело, свежий, не раздраженный, не опечаленный.

Как теперь он уныло берется за дело, отдав утреннюю свежую душу на заплытие, на загрязнение, на измучивание («чтение газет за чаем»), утомив глаза, внимание.

\*\*\*

Да: все теперь мы принимаемся без внимания за дело. Одно это не подобно ли алкоголизму?

<...>

Печатная водка. Проклятая водка. Пришло сто гадов и нагадили у меня во рту.

[О. 1. II: 367]

М.б. это к лучшему в печати («печать - 6-ая держава»), что в ней ничего не осталось, кроме «гевалта». И значение в мысли переходит к книге.<sup>71</sup>

Rozanov hoped that the printing presses would become agents of their own end. The power of words in journals and newspapers would be recognized as illusory. Rozanov describes a golden age where readers will return to the original invigorating forces of their lives. The words of prophecy and song could once more resound, they would no longer be muffled in the general noise of the press:

Гнусность печати, м. б., имеет великую и святую, нужную сторону: «Проходит лик мира сего» (Достоевск.). Ну, не очень еще... Но вот что «проходит лик печати» - это довольно явственно в распространяющемся и неустрашимом

гнушении ею, которое замечается всюду. Не читают. Бросают. Никто на нее не ссылается. Никто не ставит в авторитет.

«Прекрасное обольщение кончилось».

<...> К концу XX-го века типографии будут продаваться на снос. <...>

Люди станут опять свободны от «пишущей братии», - и м. б., тогда выучатся танцевать, устраивать рауты, полюбят музыку, полюбят обедню, будут опять любить свято и чистосердечно. Будут счастливы и серьезны.

Ибо при «печати» - конечно, людям счастья и серьезности «как своих ушей не видать».

Будет опять возможна проповедь. Будет Савонарола. Будет возможен Ап. Павел.

<...>

Зори прекрасного и великого.

Новое. Все новое.

[О. 1. II: 516-17]

Боже: неужели настанет время, когда люди будут не орать, а шептаться, не «писать статьи», а просто - жить... Жить, молчать, иногда заходить к обедне и радоваться тихой внутренней радостью...<sup>72</sup>

Print had promised an incomparable power of influence, by which even Rozanov had been seduced, but it destroyed man's spontaneous creative impulse. The ease and power with which words could be reproduced and conveyed hampered true thinking, and thus true words:

Техника, присоединившись к душе, - дала ей всемогущество. Но она же ее и раздавила. Получилась «техническая душа», лишь с механизмом творчества, а без вдохновения творчества.

(печать и Гутенберг, в суде)

[Q. 1. I: 218]

Пресса толчет души. Как душа будет жить, когда ее постоянно что-то раздробляет со стороны.

[Q. 1. II: 366]

Rozanov warned that words had become a marketable and mechanized commodity, and so lost their true value, unique to each moment of utterance. People pay more attention to the deadening words of a newspaper than to the words of a book, or even of the person next to them. When words deaden and ossify, when inspiration is replaced by axiomatic printed phrases, the relations between people also suffer this loss of life. Rozanov's concern is for the people for whom words have lost their power:

Зачем им иметь мысли, когда они владеют словом?

И зачем им усиливаться, оспаривать, побеждать, когда печатный станок разносит всякое их слово от Петербурга до Владивостока?

Тогда как обывателя едва слышит сосед, какую бы он глубокую мысль не сказал, - и нежность, и ласку, и любовь.<sup>73</sup>



Despite his contempt for contemporary literature and journalism, Rozanov was not a luddite or retrograde. He did not, like Fedorov, seek to return to the anonymity of the Middle Ages, despite his nostalgic evocations. Rozanov was excited by the possibilities of print, if wary of them. He had faith in his ability to use the technological innovations for a renewal of communication, to overcome man's distancing. He made use of print and mass publication to celebrate his individuality, and deny print's supposed uniformity. Rozanov wanted to prove that individual characters, trivia and spontaneous emotion had not been stifled by print, but would proclaim their triumph once more, by using print to their own advantage. Despite his condemnation of contemporary life, Rozanov was not a cynic. He used all his ingenuity to counteract the cynicism of his time in his writing. He had far more faith in print than he could admit.

PART TWOCHAPTER V: ROZANOV AND THE 'LITERATURNYE IZGNANNIKI'

Гул печатных станков или одного человеческого голоса. В «Литерат. Изгнанниках», пожалуй, мне и хочется собрать последние человеческие голоса. Пожалуй, это инстинкт или предсмертная (о них) тревога.<sup>1</sup>

Я понял, что в России, «быть в оппозиции» - значит любить и уважать Государя, что «быть бунтовщиком» в России - значит пойти и отстоять обедню, и, наконец, «поступить, как Стенька Разин» - это дать в морду Михайловскому с его «2-мя именинами».

[Q. 1. II: 459]

Rozanov has been claimed as a 'decadent', and at times accepted this title with a certain ironic pleasure. He has also been called a 'supreme practitioner' of symbolist prose.<sup>2</sup> Yet despite his boldness and innovation in writing and subject, Rozanov believed that he remained true to the most conservative and Russian tradition, to the isolated group of thinkers and writers who have been called the 'guardians' of traditional Russian culture. Rozanov called them the 'literaturnye izgnanniki', referring to their role as exiles and martyrs in the face of the hegemony of the prosperous so-called radicals in literary journalism. As Rozanov wrote in his memoir of Strakhov and Govorukha-

Otrok:

Тесен в литературе нашей круг людей, остающихся еще верными заветам, смыслу, и духу земли русской. Против широко раскинувшихся рядов противников эта кучка гонимых, эта партия литературных гёзов едва имеет несколько разрозненных имен. Грустна судьба их.

[Lit. izg.: 457]

Rozanov's first contact with the group of conservative and Slavophile-inclined writers such as Romanov (Rtsy) and Shperk, was on his arrival in Petersburg in 1893. However, he had already expressed his sympathy for the ideas that these writers were defending in his letters to Strakhov and Leont'ev, and in the few articles that Strakhov had helped him to publish, such as 'Zametki o vazhneishikh techeniakh russkoi filosofskoi mysli v sviazi s nashei perevodnoi literaturoi po filosofii', published in the journal Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii, which argued for a revival of Russian philosophy that would go beyond the limits of rationalism. Rozanov came to see literary activity as a battle for truth against the insidious effects of the popular creeds of positivism and nihilism. In a letter of 1891 to Leont'ev, Rozanov confides this sense of common cause:

Знаете, я всегда представляю себе всех нас, сражающихся, давших себе слово победить или умереть <...> в виде

крошечной дружины, но очень тесно связанной, и всегда хоть раз хочется взглянуть на каждого сотоварища по оружию.

Вы не сердитесь, что я все пишу «сотоварищи» - это не по осуществленному мною, но по замысленному к осуществлению.<sup>3</sup>

Even when he was associated increasingly with the decadent movement and publications, Rozanov continued to reassert his allegiance to the little known writers whom he believed were the truly original and most talented thinkers in Russia. In 1912, reflecting on the success of Uedinennoe, he writes in Opavshie list'ia:

Что это, неужели я буду «читаем» (успех «Уед.»)?

То только, что «со мною» будут читаемы, останутся в памяти и получают какой-то там «успех» (может быть ненужный) Страхов, Леонтьев, Говоруха бы Отрок (не издан); может быть, Фл. и Рцы.

Для «самого» - не надо, и м. быть, не следует.

[O. l. I: 254]

Rozanov makes repeated reference to these writers in the pages of Opavshie list'ia, referring to himself together with them as 'we'. He uses them as touchstones for his own judgements on a range of topics, social, religious and literary:

<...> в круге людей нашего созерцания считалось бы

невежливостью в отношении ума своего читать Щедрина.

За шесть лет личного знакомства со Страховым я ни разу не слышал произнесенным это имя. И не по вражде. Но - «не приходит на ум».

То же Рцы, Флоренский, Рачинский (С. А.): никогда не слышал.

Хотя, конечно, все знали суть его. Но:

- Мы все-таки учились в университете.

[Q. 1. I: 341]

Оловянная литература. Оловянные люди ее пишут. Для оловянных читателей она существует.

Sic i finis.

Конечно, Фл. ее не читает. Цв. не читает. Рцы читает только Ап. Павел и «Нов. Вр.».

Из умных никто. И я. А остальные - к черту.

[Q. 1. II: 517-18]

Rozanov seeks reassurance in the fact that there are others like him, wary of the most popular currents of contemporary literature and criticism. He argues that there is an alternative to the radical criticism that is based on a simplistic approach to social progress and improvement, but this depends on people recognizing the complexity of the individual mind, its anomalous behaviour and irrationality. It is a view of the human mind not as a chain of mechanical reactions but as an unpredictable 'soul', that responds to areas of knowledge that are beyond what can be rationally

classified. Dostoevskii had shown this in his work, and his arguments had been echoed in essays, articles and asides by Govorukha-Otrok, Giliarov-Platonov, I. F. Romanov (Rtsy), and others who were associated with the 'izgnanniki'. These writers all begin from a shared denial of the supremacy of reason as a way to truth. They allude to less definable phenomena, such as the 'hidden' movements of soul or heart, the 'unclear' instincts, that they believed, following Dostoevskii, were a powerful motivation for human behaviour. They indicated the religious instinct of man as the focus for these unclear and illogical energies that could not be contained by intellectual systems.

Govorukha-Otrok clearly echoes Dostoevskii's Zapiski iz podpol'ia in his attack on radical faiths in the article 'Zametki o progresse i tsivilizatsii', published in Russkoe obozrenie.<sup>4</sup> He writes of the new faith in 'the multiplication table' that has replaced faith in God:

Все они - и наши гегелянцы, и наши социалисты, и наши революционеры....все они хотят произнести: «Господи помилуй!», а могут припомнить только таблицу умножения, то есть логическая выкладка, стремящаяся подчинить себе живую жизнь, стремящаяся бороться с этой жизнью, с духом этой жизни.<sup>5</sup>

As well as protesting against the mechanistic reduction of the human soul to a predictable sum of reactions, these writers saw the faith in positivism or nihilism itself as

having a 'psychological' cause remote from the claims of objective necessity. Giliarov-Platonov argued that nihilism was a pathological social phenomenon, a mental illness, and a frustrated reaction to the hypocrisy and spiritual inertia of social organization, 'нигилизм есть возмущение воли русского человека'.<sup>6</sup> Govorukha-Otrok anticipates Rozanov's thought, particularly Rozanov's late articles on the revolution,<sup>7</sup> in his analysis of the superficial and 'literary' revolutionary faith that was an attempt to cover over the abyss of spiritual life:

Наша «революция» - явление психологическое, и только, а не социальное как в Западной Европе. Наши революционеры «уверовали в злодейство» более, так сказать, литературно, также литературно, как наши консерваторы веруют в свои консерватизм, наши либералы в свой либерализм, и, наконец, наши философы в свою философию. Все это у нас не результат органического процесса Жизни, а результат пустоты душевной, которую надо чем-нибудь наполнить.<sup>8</sup>

Both Govorukha-Otrok and Giliarov-Platonov emphasized that the entrenched habits and idiosyncrasies of human behaviour could not be easily dismissed from human thought. They criticized the liberal intelligentsia for condemning popular rural traditions as a 'predrazsudok', which Govorukha-Otrok claimed was the word used to attack anything beyond this intelligentsia's rational and simplistic comprehension:

<...> ведь в ином «предразсудке» гораздо больше мысли, чувства и поэзии, чем во всех «интеллигентах», взятых вместе <...>.

Человек, сохранивший еще «образ и подобие», оставшийся человеком, а не превратившийся в механическую куклу, движимую пружинами «прогресса и цивилизации», такой человек не отдаст иного предразсудка за всю гнилую и дряхлую «культуру».<sup>9</sup>

Giliarov-Platonov likewise emphasized that traditions and received ideas were the central source of a culture and language's vitality: 'Мир только и живет предразсудками, только ими и держится <...> Мир лежит в предразсудках, общежитие держится обычаем и ходячими понятиями, хранящимися между прочим в языке и в пределах литературы и жизни.'<sup>10</sup>

Despite his challenges to the Orthodox Church and his impassioned attacks on Christ, Rozanov remained very drawn to the world of such traditional Orthodox belief, sustained in words and customs rather than catechism. He preferred the company of uneducated, slightly comical, slightly weak and sinful country priests to that of zealous academic theologians or philosophers. His house was often full of such men, who would have made a sharp contrast to visiting aristocratic decadents such as Zinaida Gippius and Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, with their earnest attempts at transcendence of the flesh and metaphysical erotic fusion. Rozanov valued the long established customs that were a popular part of



Orthodox tradition, the holy days and feast days that were a powerful part of provincial life. His attention is drawn by physical details, and homely objects, which have a sacred sense for Rozanov, far greater than abstract theological debate:

Много есть прекрасного в России, 17-ое октября, конституция, как спит Иван Павлыч. Но лучше всего в чистый понедельник забирать соленья у Зайцева <...>. Рыжики, грузди какие-то вроде яблочков, брусника - разложена на тарелках <...> И образцы капусты. И нити белых грибов на косяке двери.

И над дверью большой образ Спаса, с горящею лампадой. Полное православие.

<...>

В чистый понедельник грибные и рыбные лавки первые в торговле, первые в смысле и даже в истории. Грибная лавка в чистый понедельник равняется лучшей странице Ключевского.

*(первый день Великого Поста)*

[O. 1. I: 179-80]

Rozanov's writing is a celebration of the details and objects of this fallen and physical world. He describes the lighting up of churches at Easter in his childhood in Kostroma as a celebration of man's ability to bring heaven to earth, and describes the return home from the Easter service:

<...> тут на чистой скатерти, под салфетками, благоухают кулич, пасха и красные яички. Поднесешь нос к куличу (ребенком был) - райский запах. «Ах, как все хорошо! И как хорошо, что есть вера, и как хорошо, что она - с куличами, пасхой, яйцами, с горящими на колокольнях плошками <...> и с своим домиком.» <...> Да, как хороша религия в звуках, в красках, в движениях, с иконами, с большими непременно иконами <...>.<sup>11</sup>

This evocation of provincial religious ceremony is very similar to Govorukha-Otrok's childhood memories, which informed his defence of the tradition of decorating houses and villages with flowers, leaves and birch trees on Trinity Sunday:

Убранные зеленью и цветами дом, убранный зеленью и цветами церковь, зелень и цветы, потопавшие в цветущихся на ярком весеннем солнце облаках кадильного дыма, - и мы, дети, в праздничных платьях с цветами в руках... Было во всем что-то особенное, таинственное-поэтическое, налагающее свою печать на всю душевную жизнь.<sup>12</sup>

The publication of private correspondences with footnotes, or fragments and aphorisms in journals, were the characteristic genres amongst these writers. It is ironic that men who were seen as reactionaries, by carrying on their essentially religious tradition of enquiry, made literary innovations. Their use of aphorism and

conversational address to the reader, and 'montages' of quotations, extracts from letters, and reactions to these letters in footnotes, contrasted with the more traditional forms of literary exposition of the radicals, and proved more modern. Rozanov argued that this was because the radicals had grown indifferent in their success, and lacked the stimulus of fresh enquiry. In an article on Leont'ev he describes the situation that he and his fellow writers sought to counteract: 'Цитадель ближайших штурмов был самодовольный либерализм наш, литературный, но затем также общественный и государственный. В те дни он был всемогущ'.<sup>13</sup> Rozanov repeatedly uses images of the battlefield to describe the situation of the conservative writers and the triumph of the liberals:

Штурмующие - в успехе: значит штурмуемые в отчаянии. Тоска наших переговоров, и страх, и тревога моя, наконец, «неумение распоряжаться деньгами и талантом» вытекали из того, что я входил в голодную крепость, стены которой разрушены, гарнизон пал, и в которой вообще можно было только умереть с голоду, быть убитым, или заболеть и умереть от горя.

[Lit. izg.: 271, n.1]

In his 1915 Mimoletnoe, Rozanov even describes the radical hegemony in literature as a torture chamber, in which hidden literary talents had been 'buried alive':

Радикали наши подавляли все благородное, за 50 лет. Они «замалчивали», как будто этого не было, как будто это не рождалось. И нет «Истории русской литературы», а есть «История нашего преступления».

<...> В темном обществе, как в земном погребке, они пытали лучших людей <...> в камере пыток вытягивают жилы <...> нашим прекрасным, нашим милым, нашим благородным «думцам», - от Одоевского до Страхова. Целый ряд заживо похороненных.<sup>14</sup>

Rozanov describes the contrasting fates of figures from the two camps in the second book of Opavshie list'ia:

К силе - все пристаёт, с силою (в союзе с нею) - все безопасно: и вот история нигилизма, или точнее, нигилистов в России.

Стоит сравнить тусклую, загнанную, «где-то в уголку» жизнь Страхова, у которого не было иногда щепотки чая, чтобы заварить его пришедшему другу, - с шумной, широкой, могущественной жизнью Чернышевского и Добролюбова <...> стоит сравнить жалкую полужизнь, жизнь как несчастье и горе, - Кон. Леонтьева и Гилярова-Платонова, с жизнью литературного магната Благосветлова («Дело»), и, наконец, - жизнь Пантелеева, в палатку которого собралось «Герценовское Общество» (1910-1911 г.) с его более чем сотней гостей-членов, с жизнью «Василия Васильевича и Варвары Дмитриевны», с Ге и Ивановым за чашкой чая, чтобы понять, что нигилисты и отрицатели России давно догадались,

где «раки зимуют», и побежали к золоту, побежали к чужому сытному столу, побежали к дорогим винам <...>. Нигилизм давно лижет пятки у богатого - вот в чем дело; нигилизм есть прихлебатель у знатного - вот в чем тоже дело.

[О. 1. II: 457-58]

In a letter to Gor'kii of 1912, Rozanov reproaches him for his misunderstanding of the situation. He demands how he, as a man of the Russian people, can support the radicals who have betrayed Russia:

Знаете ли вы жизнь Страхова Н. Н.? И знаете ли вы жизнь Кон. Леонтьева? <...> и его журналистика также «казнила и погребала» просто от того, что он не отрекся от России и не побегал за немецко-еврейской социал-демократией.

А вы пишете, что «страдальцами» были Щедрин и Михайловский. Полноте: стоит какой-то ужас обмана, и вы Бог знаете зачем с свободной душой и с биографией человека из народа, поплелись за колесницей, которая давила и давит все бедное, все честное, все не сдававшееся. Каткова я исключая: он - не знаю «кому брат», но он не наш, не мы. Я говорю о Гилярове-Платонове, Страхове, Кон. Леонтьеве (почти и только!), о Говорухе-Отроке... Скажите, какие «несчастненькие» эти Михайловский, у ног которого была вся Россия, и Щедрин, которого косого взгляда трепетал Лорис-Меликов.<sup>15</sup>

In an article written for Russkoe slovo, Rozanov writes that it is the peculiarity of Russia that the most valuable words and conversations are spoken in obscurity, by chance, and are not given authorized approval and publication:

Где-то в потемках захолустьев, в безвестности, в «трактире за перегородкой», куда Достоевский помещал интимнейшие беседы своих героев (Алеша и Иван Карамазовы, Версиков и его побочный сын - в «Подростке»). Всегда это в России - случай, всегда - без получения «общественного значения». Вот еще особенность России: все свинское непременно получит у нас «общественное значение», а дорогое, прекрасное, возвышенное - умрет в безвестности.<sup>16</sup>

Rozanov argues that the public and popular history of Russian literature, and particularly of its literary critics, illuminates all that is noisy and ostentatious, whereas the true history of Russian thought and writing is quiet, contemplative, and hidden:

Печальны и запутаны наши общественные и исторические дела... Всегда передо мною гипсовая маска покойного нашего философа и критика Н. Н. Страхова - снятая с него в гробу. И когда я взглядываю на это лицо человека, прошедшего в жизни нашей какою-то тенью, а не реальностью, - только от того одного, что он не шумел, не кричал, не агитировал, не обличал, а сидел тихо и тихо писал книги, - у меня душа

мутится...

Судьба Константина Леонтьева и Говорухи-Отрока...

Да и сколько таких. Поистине <...> «прогресс наш» совершился при «непременном требовании» <...> чтобы были убраны «с глаз долой» все люди с задумчивостью, пытливостью, с оглядкой на себя и обстоятельства.

С старой любовью к старой родине..

[О. 1. I: 338-39]

Rozanov was drawn to these writers as he claimed to be drawn to anything 'injured' or 'neglected', to the meek and forgotten existences in a noisy and attention-seeking modernity, but he also recognized the rich source of their writings that made them stand apart with a rare depth and individuality from the repetitive mediocrity of most of contemporary literature. Despite being grouped together as 'exiles' and 'conservatives', each was alone in his individual task of thought and self-exploration. Thus they are lonely thinkers, isolated both in their social position and in their daily work. Dmitrii Mirsky shares Rozanov's view that the obscure conservatives harboured the most original intellectual talents of the time. He wrote in his History of Russian Literature: 'only a small minority of thinking people - but among them perhaps the most independent, original, and sincere minds of the day - showed a critical attitude towards the dogma of agnosticism and democracy, and strove towards a creative revival of Christian and national ideas. <...> independent

conservative writers <...> had to struggle against general indifference and its consequences, unemployment and poverty.'<sup>17</sup>

In a handwritten note to Strakhov's letters, Rozanov compares the situation in which these men were writing to the persecution of the early Christians under Diocletian or Nero, he writes of Strakhov as a transfigured 'Christian and philosophical' martyr.<sup>18</sup> Aware that he was more worldly, and more of an active operator in literary and journalistic politics than they, he wrote that he wanted literary success only if it would make their names more famous as well:

В чем мое отличие в литературе?

В деятельности этого «нашего направления».

Все, Гиляров-Платонов, Киреевские, Хомяков, Аксаковы, были при замечательной красоте души и глубине мысли как-то бездеятельны, не живы. Все - «милые рассуждающие Обломовы» <...> Все с чудовищной головой и без ног. И их, бедных, затоптали жиденские Белинский, Некрасов, Герцен, Чернышевский.

У Чернышевского было 5 ног.

Суть меня в том, что у меня тоже выросло «5 ног» <...> мое «прекрасное» в том, что я полюбил этих тихих и милых людей <...> разглядел, что они первые по уму в России. И приложил свое деятельное и хитрое плечо к их «успеху».<sup>19</sup>

The enthusiasm with which Rozanov defended these writers



stems not so much from the fact that he shared their fate, but rather that they represented an ideal of purity in relation to their own writings that he perhaps felt in danger of losing. He was aware of his own wiliness (khitrost'), that allowed him to exploit and maximize the potential of publication in a way that was uncharacteristic of these writers, but he also knew that his urge to publish and the ease with which he found a successful literary style perhaps threatened values that were bound up in slowness and quiet. In Uedinennoe, he contrasts his literary success with the obscurity of Rtsy and Shperk, yet asserts that the friendship and respect of these men gives him far more pleasure than his best reviews:

Трех людей я встретил умнее или, вернее, даровитее, оригинальнее, самобытнее себя: Шперка, Рцы и Фл-го. <...> их слова, мысли, суждения, самые коротенькие, освещали часто целую мировую область. Все были почти славянофилы, но в сущности - не славянофилы, а одиночки, «я»... <...>

Но над всеми перечисленными я имел преимущества хитрости (русское «себя на уме») и, может быть, от этого не погиб (литературно), как эти несчастные («неудачники») <...>. Сравнительно с «Рцы» и Шперком, как обширно развернулась моя литературная деятельность, сколько уже издано книг... Но за всю мою жизнь никакие печатные отзывы, никакие дифирамбы (в той же печати) не дали мне этой спокойной, хорошей гордости, как дружба и (я чувствовал) уважение (от Шперка - и любовь) этих трех людей.

Но какова судьба литературы: отчего они так не знамениты, отвергнуты, забыты?

[Ued.: 109-10]

Rozanov wrote of his own need to write for many different journals of different views, and under many pseudonyms, but he described this as an intellectual fate rather than, as he would have argued for the other literary exiles, the only means of survival.<sup>20</sup> The lack of recognition showed itself also in the titles of works: for example, Rozanov's articles on Leont'ev 'Neuznannyi fenomen' and 'Neotsenimyi um' echo the title of Sharapov's book about Giliarov-Platonov, Neopoznannyi genii.<sup>21</sup> All underlined a sense of undeserved obscurity.

Rozanov sought to publish a series of books of letters from these men, together with his own commentaries and footnotes, as a tribute to their quiet labour. He outlines this in his second book of Opavshie list'ia and in Mimoletnoe. In Opavshie list'ia, the proposed collection is to contain letters from Rtsy (I. F. Romanov), Shperk, Florenskii and Tsvetkov as well as Strakhov's letters, which were actually published in the way that Rozanov intended, together with letters from Govorukha-Otrok, as Literaturnye izgnanniki in 1913.<sup>22</sup> Rozanov cites for publication in this series Leont'ev's and Rachinskii's letters, with his own footnotes. Rozanov describes the photographs that he would include with the letters. As in Opavshie list'ia, photographs are to be included which

emphasize personal, domestic intimacy, often of the writers with their families. In Mimoletnoe of 1915, Rozanov lists the volumes that he wants to follow his edition of Strakhov and Govorukha-Otrok: vol.II - Kuskov and Leont'ev, vol.III - Rachinskii and Rtsy, vol.IV - Shperk and Tsvetkov, vol.V - Mordvinova.<sup>23</sup>

The publication of Leont'ev's and Rachinskii's letters in Russkii vestnik and the book of Strakhov's and Govorukha-Otrok's letters, remained the full extent of this project, which, together with Rozanov's footnotes and commentaries, would have yielded much valuable knowledge about the more obscure figures in Russian writing at his time. Rozanov believed that the edition would be successful, even proposing the commissioning of an engraving of the philosopher Shperk on his deathbed, in the confidence that this could be financed by sales. However, as Sukach notes, even the letters that were published were not popular, the 1913 Literaturnye izgnanniki did not sell, it demanded too rarified a literary taste and interest.<sup>24</sup>

As noted already in Chapter IV, the most striking formal innovation in these collections of letters was that of the extensive footnotes which Rozanov virtually made a genre of its own. The footnotes themselves contain entire disquisitions on the evils of the press, the corruption of government, and past literary polemics. Rozanov's remarks often have the immediacy of an instant reaction to the situation, but maintain the authority of hindsight. The tone is extremely conversational, both ruminatory and

exclamatory. Thus even in the intimate and homely context that Rozanov sets there is a space for polemic, for engagement with contemporary political debate. As in the opavshie list'ia genre, what seems to be ostensibly a personal and intimate questioning makes use of its very intimacy to grapple with current political issues, to attack contemporary figures and vested interests. In the opavshie list'ia, the dialogue is with himself, but in the letters published in Literaturnye izgnanniki, Rozanov creates a dialogue with the other writer's thoughts, as well as with his own. As well as using the footnote to express political views, Rozanov makes the other's reflections the occasion of his own self-revelation to the reader, in both philosophical and autobiographical detail.

Rozanov claimed that his own writing, despite its novelty and challenge to literary tradition, was motivated by the same values that he saw these writers as sharing. Together with a respect for the Russian Orthodox tradition, this also meant a certain way of living and writing. Rozanov praised these writers' love of silence, solitude, old books and friendship in the ancient sense as spiritual exchange, in the intimate context of letter writing or private conversations. He found in them a community bound by implicit shared values, experience, and tradition. These were values that could not always be spoken. The power of silence and intonation for Rozanov, discussed in the first part, was exemplified for him in these writers. Rozanov emphasizes the importance of the communication of thought

that takes place in silences and in the tones of voice when talking with these writers. He continually speaks of his conversations with them as having a power and vitality that could not be imitated in print. Unlike the radicals, for whom the important thing was fame and publication, he argues that these writers valued private conversations about sacred and often 'inexpressible' themes. He describes an intense mutual understanding, beyond words, in his conversations with the young philosopher Shperk:

Особенность беседы с ним заключалась в том, что она служила как бы продолжением, только дальнейшим движением субъективной вашей жизни, что не чувствовалось вовсе никакой внешней преграды, которая задерживала бы непониманием или неправильным отношением вашу мысль, как и обратно вы чувствовали себя не защищенным, не закрытым от его мысли или слова. Едва завязывался разговор, как материальные и всегда задерживающие условия бытия нашего - материальные не в вещественном только смысле <...> куда-то пропадали, и открывалось чистое умственное или нравственное общение.<sup>25</sup>

Rozanov was attempting to do in print what he described as the crucial shortcoming of the 'literary exiles', to make published work speak with the resonance, vitality, and asides of a private conversation. He sought readers who would respond with the same implicit understanding as he experienced in the presence of these

writers. Rozanov makes clear that for many of these writers it was difficult to acquire a publishable style. He describes the fate of Shperk, the young philosopher, whose conversation was compelling and yet whose writing was almost unreadable: 'Мне, в силу указанного недостатка, он казался потерянным для литературы, или точнее - казался не найденным, не открытым и не открываемым для нее, при всем богатстве своих мыслей.'<sup>26</sup> The theme of the disparity between literary style and profundity of thought is recurrent in Rozanov's writing. Those who have much to write about may not be able to write: 'есть люди с великими темами, но без слов; и есть люди с богатыми словами, но которые родились без тем'.<sup>27</sup> Rtsy, Rozanov believes, had the power of an Old Testament figure in his spoken words, but this spontaneity was not conveyed in print:

Рцы все бегаёт за Богом, все томится по Боге и говорит лучшие молитвы, какие знает мир (в себе, в душе).

Увы: литературно это почти ни в чем не выразилось. Он писал только об еде, о Россини и иногда об отцах Церкви. Теперь, бедный, умолк.

[O. 1. II: 499]

As already indicated, the voice is very important for Rozanov. It is a guarantee of the emotional and intonational context of meaning, vital for this religious tradition of philosophical enquiry. Rozanov focuses on the voices of Strakhov, Leont'ev and Shperk, he records the

passing spoken words of Rtsy and Florenskii, using quotation marks, as though directly spoken, in a bid to preserve as closely as possible their individual voices in print. These are frequently set within the context of the physical surroundings and circumstances in which the conversation takes place and which forms the background of the intonation. Such details are particularly important in characterizing the 'literary exiles' and the specifically Russian context of their conversations, which took place in the intimacy and privacy of small flats in St Petersburg and Moscow. Rozanov was seeking less to preserve the printed sum of these writers' published ideas, than to catch the living, passing voices, to allow his readers to sense their warmth and tone. Thus he describes listening sleepily to Shperk reading his poem:

А Шперк все тем же музыкальным, вникающим в душу голосом читал «Душа моя» (поэма его в белых стихах).

- Вы читайте, Федор Едуардович, а я полежу, сказал я. И в чтении его - все было понятно, как в разговорах его - все понятно. Но когда сам его читаешь по-печатному - ничего не понимаешь.

Я встал. Он улыбнулся. Он никогда на меня не сердился, зная, что я никогда не захочу его обидеть. И мы пошли пить чай.

[Q. 1. I: 238]

The 'literary exiles' are seen as the last human voices,

amidst the constant noise of the railways and printing press. Rozanov was characteristically exploiting the potential of these latest technological advances in a bid to make these fragile but profound voices heard, just as he printed his own work, while claiming it to be a manuscript, or 'whispers'. Rozanov asks the reader to pay attention to the individual 'tone' in which these letters are written. He appeals to his reader's 'ear' for the writing, over any logical analysis or desire for information.

Rozanov's publication of his letters from these 'literary exiles' was an attempt to give the reader access to the private conversations on 'ultimate questions' that are not those of the newspaper sheet or latest radical debate. The physical setting is evoked as though Rozanov is bringing the reader into the private studies and apartments, shutting out the noise of the public area of debate. As in the opavshie list'ia, this is done in a tone of persuasive intimacy:

Печатаемые ниже письма издаются совсем в другом тоне; - с другим чувством, в другом намерении. История - умолкла. Площади - нет; улицы - нет. Дверь крепко заперта. Горит старая русская свечка, даже едва ли стеариновая. Сам я в туфлях и гости мои в туфлях. Тут - «мы»; и это - «наши письма», где мы спорим, ругаемся, любимся друг другом или по крайней мере я люблюсь своими корреспондентами.

[Lit. izg.: ix-x]



The intimate setting, in slippers and dressing gown, is Rozanov's ideal image for what he most values in literature, thus he praises the merits of Barsukov's book about Kostomarov and Maikov, 'мы у себя дома, в халате, и в халатах же ходят около нас парнасец-поэт и так волновавшийся историк'.<sup>28</sup> In Opavshie list'ia, Rozanov contrasted his sacred aims in writing with their threatened betrayal in the literary arena:

...а ведь по существу-то - Боже! Боже! - в душе моей  
вечно стоял монастырь.

Неужели мне нужна была площадь ?

Брррр...

[O. 1. I: 112]

The 'literary exiles' represented the 'monastery' that was for Rozanov a refuge from the public meeting place of literary politics and publication.

### RTSY

This and the next two sections look at individual writers, Rtsy, Strakhov and Leont'ev, who were in very different ways, 'exiles' and influential figures for Rozanov, while the final section of the chapter looks at Solov'ev, who, though not an 'exile', was still perceived by Rozanov as a victim of fashionable radicalism, and at odds with his

time. All four had correspondences with Rozanov.

The first 'Rtsy' (Ivan Fedorovich Romanov)<sup>29</sup> is less well known than Strakhov or Leont'ev, who were 'literary exiles' of an older generation. Rozanov intended that Rtsy should be second in the Literaturnye izgnanniki series.<sup>30</sup> He is chosen as the most important example of the 'literary exiles' and close friends from within Rozanov's own generation whose letters he sought to publish in the series, which also included Govorukha-Otrok, Shperk, Tsvetkov and Florenskii.<sup>31</sup> In his introduction to the publication of Rtsy's letters to Rozanov, Ivask remarks, 'Существенно, что этот «маленький Розанов», как его иногда называли, оказал некоторое влияние на «большого Розанова».'<sup>32</sup> Rozanov himself claimed that Rtsy was one of only three writers (the others being Shperk and Florenskii), whom he considered more original and talented than himself,<sup>33</sup> and he probably considered himself closest to Rtsy. Rtsy's affirmed Orthodoxy and his persistent attempts to convince Rozanov to recognize his own Orthodox and Slavophile inheritance impressed Rozanov. He admired Rtsy's combination of physicality and spirit. He notes Rtsy's constant prayer to God.<sup>34</sup> Rozanov praised Rtsy's indifference to contemporary journalism and asserted that Rtsy's only reading was St. Paul and Novoe vremia.<sup>35</sup>

Rtsy's letters to Rozanov are full of recognizable themes from Rozanov's later writings. He describes the collaborative hegemony of nihilist journalists and the state censorship,<sup>36</sup> the difficulties of publishing original

work, the insidious power of the printing press, the dullness and lack of talent in contemporary life, as well as the importance of understanding sex as a religious act,<sup>37</sup> and the value of thoughts that defy verbal expression. Rtsy anticipates a Rozanovian theme when he writes of the superior power of speech to words in print.<sup>38</sup> His insistence on his ostracism from literature probably helped to formulate Rozanov's defiant campaign for the recognition of the 'literary exiles'.<sup>39</sup> The excitement of the tone of his letters is at times similar to Rozanov's description of his discovery of Leont'ev. He speaks of his deep hunger for mutual understanding. In an early letter to Rozanov, Rtsy describes his own anticipation on receiving Rozanov's letter: 'чрезвычайное значение, которое придавал РЦЫ названному, так страстно ожидаемому письму... Такова жажда души его приобрести брата по духу столь населенной пустыни века сего...' <sup>40</sup> Rozanov similarly noted the intensity of shared understanding in a hostile intellectual climate:

С РЦЫ мы понимали друг друга с 1/2 слова, с намека; но он был беден, как и я, «не нужен в мире», как и я (себя чувствовал). Вот эта «ненужность», «отшвырнутость» от мира ужасно соединяет, и «страшно все сразу становится понятным»; и люди не на словах становятся братья.

[O. I. I: 175]

In 1892 Rtsy published a book of short and aphoristic

reflections called Listopad, originally intended for publication as individual 'notebooks',<sup>41</sup> that anticipates and may have influenced the title and format of Opavshie list'ia.<sup>42</sup> He also edited and published the journal Letopisets, which lasted only for the year 1904. In its introductory statement, the journal claimed to be seeking a synthesis of faith and knowledge: '«Летописец <...> верит в возможности широкого синтеза веры и знания, мистических упований сердца и пытливых исканий вечно сомневающегося разума»'.<sup>43</sup> The journal gave a great deal of space to the publication of letters; the serialization of Giliarov-Platonov's letters to Rtsy together with Rtsy's footnotes adopts the form set by Rozanov in his publication of Leont'ev's letters the previous year.<sup>44</sup> It is very likely that Rtsy was influenced by Rozanov's exploitation of the footnote. He too uses the footnote to comment on contemporary literary politics, for a direct, concise entry into an argument, and for enthusiastic conversational exclamations of agreement. His style directly echoes Rozanov. In response to Giliarov-Platonov's remark that the Slavophile point of view is too narrow, he writes a footnote: 'Боже, до чего это верно! Как ясно сознаю и как мучительно чувствую глубокую правду этого, как мне казалось тогда, «еретического буесловия»!' <sup>45</sup> The reference to the evolution of his own thought, and the use of quotation, as well as the excited and familiar tone of approval are supremely Rozanovian. When Giliarov-Platonov further protests his intellectual solitude, 'Я один, я не человек

кружка. Вот мое несчастье', Rtsy responds in a footnote, as Rozanov would, with reflections on the isolation of intellectual talent in Russia: 'Это грустное признание допускает, кажется, очень широкое обобщение для наших нравов... Вечно, вечно Русь святая «в разброд бредет»!...' <sup>46</sup> Complaint about the obstacles to publishing their ideas was common amongst these men, who relied on private letters as much as public articles for intellectual exchange, in contrast to the well-established channels for publishing and debate among the radicals. Rtsy's account of his enforced touting about to find journals that would publish him in the first edition of Letopisets is characteristic:

Никогда не удавалось мне в «моей блуждающей судьбе» пристроиться прочно и на долго к какому-нибудь направлению, кружку, журнальному толку. Отсюда мои литературные опыты представляют с внешней стороны «разсыпавшуюся храмину». Столько изданий, притом самых противоположных направлений, оказывали мне приют, столько переменял я за свою литературную деятельность псевдонимов, что и сам я не без затруднений и вероятно не без пропусков откапываю себя из-под груд газетных, большей частью, листов. <sup>47</sup>

This passage, where Rtsy characterizes the fate of the independent thinker in journalistic politics can be compared to Rozanov's description of the dispersion of Govorukha-Otrok's (pseudonym, Iu. Nikolaev) articles:

Едва ли это не был наш лучший критик за 80-ые и 90-ые годы, обстоятельные, умные и хорошо написанные статьи которого погребены в забытых листах газет и никогда не были собраны, изданы <...>. Посмотрите у радикалов: опера omnia даже Ангела Богдановича из «Соврем. Мира» собраны, у которого на том печати едва-ли есть 2-3 не то чтобы хороших, но хоть каких-нибудь, мыслей. У консерваторов - все лежит, и никто ни о ком не заботится <...>.

У Ю. Николаева был прекрасный тон письма. <...> С изданиями, где он участвовал («Московск. Вед.» и «Рус. Обозр.») он не очень сливался, - как в сущности вовсе не были слиты с ними и Страхов и Розанов. «Где-же печататься» и «все равно».

[Lit. izg.: 263, n. 1 and 2]

Rtsy is very similar to Rozanov in his complaints against lack of literary recognition and his assumed indifference to it. His letters are marked by an insistent passion and sensitivity about his own fate that is also close to Rozanov. They are also full of original ideas and viewpoints on Rozanovian subjects which suggest that he was an important stimulus for Rozanov's thought, both overtly, as in the opavshie list'ia genre, where Rozanov refers to Rtsy's ideas, and in a private and less acknowledged way in Rozanov's other books and articles.

NIKOLAI STRAKHOV

Rozanov's published correspondences with the 'literary exiles' are revealing not only of similarities, but also for the way in which they show the meetings of two different, and not always sympathetic, minds. The correspondence with Strakhov is particularly valuable in this respect, for the way in which it reveals the enthusiasms of two men of different generations and a very different outlook. Rozanov included Strakhov among his 'literary exiles', because he was an independent thinker who he believed was undervalued in his time, but his style of thought and literary exposition was very different to Rozanov's. Rozanov presents him as a sort of father figure to the younger generation of 'exiles'. He himself referred to Strakhov as his 'guardian' and 'literary nanny', a reference to his important role at the start of Rozanov's career; Rozanov in turn became a 'guardian' of Strakhov's memory in an unreceptive intellectual climate. Despite fundamental differences in their approach to writing, the intimacy of a correspondence reveals meeting points of enquiry and undefined areas of their thought that would be excluded from more public forms of expression.

The letters and footnotes bring us away from the formalized monologues of the public arena into the midst of dialogue. The dialogue has three immediate interlocutors: Strakhov is addressing and answering Rozanov of 1891, and Rozanov of 1913 is answering the now dead Strakhov, twenty

two years later. Rozanov and Strakhov would both be talking with the consciousness of further addressees, which for Strakhov could be other possible readers, but also the ultimate reference of God or philosophical truth. For Rozanov this distant reference also exists, but in Literaturnye izgnanniki the immediate witness of his readers, whom he addresses directly and with urgency in his footnotes of 1913, is also important. Strakhov and Rozanov both make frequent use of quotation in their responses: Strakhov quotes Rozanov back to him and Rozanov quotes himself and others, to further complicate the background against which these utterances have resonance. It is left for the successive generations of readers to engage with the complex entirety of address and response on its various levels. The result is that instead of any last word, we are thrown into a continuous dialogue of words and reactions.

Rozanov compares his publication of Strakhov and Govorukha-Otrok's letters with his book of Suvorin's letters, and describes them as relationships that are, respectively, subjective and objective. Indeed sometimes it seems as though Rozanov goes further and makes his 'subjective' subjects into expressions of his own personal spiritual aspirations. Because they are set up as the 'monastery' as opposed to the 'public square', these writers become, in Rozanov's critical evaluation, the reserve of all the values that he feels are being ignored by contemporary literature. At times this makes Rozanov's writing about them more expressive of his own sympathies



and ideals than of the true character of their thought. For example, Rozanov wrote of religion as the central, unspoken centre of Strakhov's activity, yet Linda Gerstein claims that Strakhov objected to Rozanov's overly religious interpretation of his work.<sup>48</sup>

Strakhov warned Rozanov that he should control his moods and his style. Yet he was also grateful for the attention of the young provincial writer, admiring his facility of expression, while warning against the pitfalls of spontaneous thought uncontrolled by an ordering method. Although he grumbled in his letters that Rozanov was overly dependent on him, Strakhov valued his guardianship over this emerging talent, referring to him as 'my Rozanov'. Strakhov not only found Rozanov a job in the state department, so that he could move to St Petersburg, he also introduced him to editors and put forward his articles for publication. He helped establish Rozanov's ties to the editor Nikolai Grot, who founded Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii in the 1890s and remained a loyal publisher of Rozanov.

However, Strakhov was more than just a practical godfather. Rozanov made Strakhov a symbol of an ideal literary attitude that would be a touchpoint for his future writing. He represents the reserve of questions and values that are eternal, that can counteract the 'literary nihilism', whose symbolic representatives are no longer Chernyshevskii and Pisarev, but the critic Mikhailovskii and Saltykov-Shchedrin. Strakhov is represented as

independent of any political grouping. His is the thought that belongs to no party, but must be carried on alone. Rozanov sees him as a touchstone of independent rigour in thought for the younger generation.<sup>49</sup> Rozanov's modernist reaction against the retrograde radical literary tradition was inspired by the example of the conservative writers and colleagues of the previous generation: Dostoevskii, Grigor'ev and Strakhov. Yet it is to Strakhov, above all, that he attributes the preservation of independent critical enquiry against the prevailing radical dogmas of the 1870s and 1880s: 'Да... приходится сказать странную вещь, что в двадцатилетие после 60-х годов, Страхов был единственным у нас живым, подвижным, свободным и шедшим вперед мыслителем.' [Lit. izg.: 12]

Strakhov was as much a product of nineteenth century faith in knowledge and empirical truth as any materialist. He wrote on biology and the natural sciences, respected the authority of facts and objective knowledge, and was highly suspicious of 'subjective' or 'emotive' judgements. Yet Rozanov argues that it was the very immensity of his intellectual hunger for material knowledge that led him to doubt these absolutes. As knowledgeable as the empiricists in the human sciences, Strakhov broke with the stalemate of empirical, positivist thought in these areas; even Solov'ev, whose criticism of Western positivist principles in philosophy had been so crucial to the evolution of Russian thought, had not been so penetrating in his critique as Strakhov.<sup>50</sup> For this reason, Strakhov is very

important to Rozanov as he embodies, in Rozanov's account, the intellectual and psychological conflict and transitions taking place in Russian society. Strakhov's own doubts and sense of the impossibility of living with an exclusively rational approach to knowledge represent the impasse of thought to which Rozanov believes that every thinking Russian must come.<sup>51</sup>

Rozanov describes this central conflict in Strakhov's work as similar to his own intellectual experience. A generation younger than Strakhov, he also had engaged in the enthusiastic pursuit of rational knowledge, fired by faith in an ultimate truth which it seemed that this would lead to; he too felt the limitations of this approach and sought out instead the unclear, the undefined areas of human thought that are impenetrable to reason alone. It is a predilection for these very areas that he emphasizes in Strakhov's thought: 'с неудержимой силой его мысль влечется к темным и неясным сторонам в жизни природы, во всемирной истории и в вопросах общественных'. [Lit. izg.: 7] Rozanov was drawn to the murky areas of half-light, where he believed that the most sacred phenomena occurred, hidden from rational evaluation. Thus he describes a sort of obscuring that takes place at the moment of conception, in 'Novye embriony': '...на критической точке, в критическом переломе вдруг появляется мутность, и все силы микроскопа и острота скальпеля или иголки оказываются неприменимы. <....> И так хочется, и так трудно взглянуть сюда.'<sup>52</sup> The image is symbolic for Rozanov of the crucial moments of

man's physical life that touch on the metaphysical, but which cannot be penetrated with all the might of his intellectual weaponry. Rozanov valued in Strakhov his interest in such areas of biological life that were on the boundary of the physical and the metaphysical.<sup>53</sup> Strakhov insisted that idealism cannot ignore the physical sciences and defended these emphatically against the mystic, 'spiritualist' enthusiasms of the 1890s.<sup>54</sup> Yet Rozanov claims that Strakhov's most persistent concern was with what he would not explicitly describe, with God and the soul.<sup>55</sup> He saw this as the inevitable preoccupation of someone for whom purely intellectual theory had become punishingly insufficient:

Слишком глубокий теоретизм душевного склада потому, быть может, и вызывает неудовлетворенность, что всякого, кто имел несчастье дойти до него, он отделяет глубокою и уже никогда не переступаемою чертой от всего живого и единичного.

[Lit. izq.: 50-51]

This sense of loss is, in Rozanov's view, a stimulus towards a more religious search. Strakhov's solution for this dissatisfaction was not necessarily religious, but Rozanov sought to interpret it as such.

Rozanov's account of Strakhov's love and complex understanding of Western civilization, despite his intellectual battle against its consequences, makes him

portray him in the spirit of Versilov in Dostoevskii's Podrostok, so admired by Rozanov, who understood both the intellectual ambition and spiritual need of Europe. Strakhov becomes symbolic of the vulnerability of Russia, in her craving for Western ideas, that fail to satisfy a more fundamental hunger. Rozanov describes this in Literaturnye izgnanniki: 'чем глубже входим мы в духовный мир Европы и чем теснее сливаемся с ним, тем сильнее поднимается у нас чувство странной неудовлетворенности, необыкновенной душевной усталости'. [Lit. izg.: 31]

Rozanov's early article on Strakhov, 'O bor'be s Zapadom v sviazi s literaturnoi deiatel'nost'iu odnogo iz slavianofilov', written in Elets in 1890,<sup>56</sup> demonstrates the way in which Rozanov used his writing about other writers to express and elucidate his own writing and literary aspirations. He emphasizes the philosophical role of Strakhov's writing.<sup>57</sup> Rozanov described Strakhov as carrying out a search for the eternal in his literary criticism: 'В явлениях литературы его более всего интересуют произведения, в которых среди мимолетного и бегущего уловлены вечныя черты человеческого существа и вечныя основы, по которым движется жизнь народов'. [Lit. izg.: 13] Strakhov made a similar evaluation of Rozanov in his review of Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore: 'Мы видим, притом, прием г. Розанова: он обобщает Достоевского, он смотрит на него с вековой точки зрения.'<sup>58</sup> Rozanov was dissatisfied with most of contemporary literature which he judged insufficient to answer man's most constant needs,

the central problems of living and death. He preferred thinkers to 'artistic' writers, except for those who kept both thought and literary construction intertwined at a high pitch, like Dostoevskii.

Rozanov emphasizes Strakhov's value for individual character (litso) in literature, a constant of Rozanov's own literary criticism. Rozanov uses the image of facial expressions as an indication of inner questioning. Strakhov 'stares penetratingly into people's faces', and also into the faces that are revealed only in published words:

<...> он пытливо всматривается в лица людей, <...> и ищет в них выражения тревоги и смущения. <...> Можно сказать, что духовная физиономия этих писателей, внутренний и скрытый центр их деятельности, так хорошо известной и так мало понятой, впервые раскрылись в своем истинном значении в этих статьях. Объективное значение трудов этих писателей, их содержание и то новое, что оно пытается внести в науку - все это, как второстепенное и имеющее пройти, оставлено в стороне г. Страховым. Он рассматривает эти труды не в их значении для читателей, но в их отношении к самим писателям, как показателей их внутреннего настроения.

[Lit. izg.: 14-15]

Despite Strakhov's intellectual and even systematic rigour, Rozanov praised his concentration on individual character over any finished system. Rozanov believed that Strakhov was less interested in the objective content of

the work than in the individual spiritual needs that demanded its writing. In this respect Strakhov's criticism shows the influence of Grigor'ev. Strakhov saw literature as a continuous organic process, which evolved through individual effort. He acknowledged his critical debt to Grigor'ev and to those writers that had influenced Grigor'ev, Kireevskii and the German idealists. Grigor'ev's influence is most evident in Strakhov's analysis of Voyna i mir, which Gerstein believes best exemplifies Strakhov's literary credo.<sup>59</sup> Strakhov explained the development of his critical method by the realization of the incapacity of systematic thought to penetrate the formlessness and chaos of contemporary Russian life and literature, which resisted any clear logical form or definition.<sup>60</sup> He claimed to be attempting to find a resilient viewpoint amidst this chaos.<sup>61</sup> Like Rozanov, Strakhov criticized the lack of a strongly rooted culture in Russia, the 'half-education' that led to a cynical critical attitude, to the popular success of an attitude of denial, which stemmed only from the critics' own intellectual insecurity: 'ничто не уважается, во всем отыскивается темная сторона. Начинается дешевый скептицизм, копеечное, лакейское критиканство...'<sup>62</sup> Rozanov was equally condemning of the negative critics, the satirists and detractors of Russia who gained such easy success.

Rozanov claimed that the reader of Strakhov experiences an intense engagement with the process of Strakhov's thought:

Никакой дисгармонии между своею душою и книгою он не испытывает; все временное, все личное, <...> - также как и тогда, когда он остается наедине с собою, уходит куда-то в безграничную даль и пропадает. Мысли, в действительности усваиваемыя им извне, как будто вырастают в его собственной душе и развиваются в ней.

<...> Он <...> не так наполняет ум, как приготовляет его к принятию истинно-достойного содержания.

[Lit. izq.: 64]

This passage could be read as a statement of Rozanov's own literary intentions; as argued in Chapter III, Rozanov was aiming at a similar intensity and empathetic relationship with the reader in his own writing. Rozanov praised Strakhov's ability to put forward the writings of others with great sensitivity, while keeping his own views to himself. Yet he knew that this was his own weakness, he found it hard to write about others without expressing his own sympathies.<sup>63</sup>

Rozanov described Strakhov's lonely fate as an exile, characteristically making reference to the prophets. The 'literary exiles' were repeatedly described as prophets and martyrs of Russian thought: '«Дружбы! близости! понимания!» - увы, об этом вздыхали и пророки'. [Lit. izq.: 210-11, n.1] Strakhov did not even live long enough to encounter the potential sympathy of the new generation of Slavophiles, men such as Florenskii, Bulgakov and Tsvetkov, and the 'Put'' publishing house. Rozanov described him as carrying



the flickering candle of Slavophile beliefs for this generation, for which they must be grateful.<sup>64</sup> However, in a letter to Leont'ev, Rozanov contradicts this view and argues that Strakhov did indeed seek worldly fame, and not for noble motives. His attack here is in sharp contrast to the tone of all his public writings about Strakhov, where he insists on the purity of his motives and attitude to his reader. Characteristically he sees the duplicity of Strakhov's intentions exemplified in the physical resonance of his voice:

Но, знаете, темную сторону в складе его характера, его сердца я давно прозреваю: он очень холоден, сух, эгоистичен; он завистлив к всякому дарованию и почти ненавидит его, когда он имеет успех; <...> он, не надеясь покорить себе читателей, как-то искусственно сколачивает себе славу: то там, то здесь искусственными мерами силится возбудить к себе внимание. <...> у него характерный неприятный деланный голос, при величайшем благообразии наружности: не верно ли отражение его духовной сути?<sup>65</sup>

In accordance with his view that the physical details of a writer could reveal more about his true sympathies and sufferings than many pages of his works, Rozanov also paid concentrated attention to Strakhov's face, handwriting, clothes and surroundings as an expression of his inner character. In Literaturnye izgnanniki, he claimed that Strakhov's 'fine face' was more convincing than his

argument: 'не убеждаемый нисколько доводами, смотря лишь на прекрасное лицо Страхова, я поддавался и предпочитал молчать, видя его гнев'. [Lit. izg.: 492] He notes the precision of Strakhov's handwriting.<sup>66</sup> He also describes Strakhov's room in a footnote to one of his letters; it reflects the austerity of a life lived in service of literary authority: 'Книги занимали все поле стен. <...> Никаких кушеток и никакой мягкой мебели у него не было'. [Lit. izg.: 344-45, n.2] It was Strakhov's intellectual detachment that was Rozanov's more persistent criticism, and lasting concern. Rozanov was himself troubled by this sense of being an observer, of lacking a living connection to life. In his essay on Strakhov, he emphasizes the painful consequences of too great a theoretical enthusiasm, a passion which throws one's existence out of balance and cuts one off irrevocably from the spontaneous experience of life. Rozanov intimates similar conflicts within himself. As with Strakhov, he attributes his detachment to his isolated childhood and subsequent passion for knowledge, also of a materialist sort. Thus Rozanov's emphasis on Strakhov's unrealizable religious longings, his 'constant secret sadness',<sup>67</sup> and the conflict between his materialist and idealist inclinations is motivated by an attempt to understand his own experience within the same culture.

Strakhov himself was aware that his skills of intellectual observation and sympathy for the ideas of others did not compensate for a fully lived life. He laments this in a letter to Tolstoi: 'Думаю, что я не

какой-нибудь гадкий или преступный, или отчаянно-грешный человек. Я в известном отношении хуже - я человек безжизненный, в котором мало души, нет воли в смысле живых стремлений.'<sup>68</sup> Rozanov's same fear of not living was the source of his literature and yet it was what provoked his greatest doubts about his literature. Writing was an attempt to hold on to the evanescence of life, yet it could also be an evasion of life, and a too-literary consciousness prevented one from experiencing life directly, other than in the forms by which it could be transcribed into literature.

In 'Vechnaia pamiat'', his memorial article to Strakhov, Rozanov describes in detail the circumstances of Strakhov's death. He describes his sense of how Strakhov's book-lined room becomes increasingly like a tomb, and in one emphatic outburst he rails against the death in life of the literary existence: 'я почувствовал, что это огромный гроб, среди книжных сокровищ. <...> Гроб, гроб ошибочно прожившего человека, гроб не понявшего смысл жизни человека: где твоя ученость, для чего она?' [Lit. izg.: 511] Rozanov chose to ignore the authority of scholarship, much to Strakhov's dismay. He was too fearful of losing his ephemeral source of life. In his memoir of Strakhov he describes what was perhaps the fundamental difference between them: 'он не жил сосредоточенною теперь жизнью и более ярко горела перед ним жизнь минувшая, как и готовая настать. Богу известно, которое из этого лучше; мне же всегда казалось грустною, а следовательно и ошибочною жизнь

таких людей.' [Lit. izg.: 511-12]

In Strakhov, Rozanov said that he had found deep sympathy with an essentially different character. Indeed he even claimed that the strength of his relationship with Strakhov was in its distance. This relationship is in contrast to the intimate unity of spirit that Rozanov describes in his conversations with other 'literary exiles', such as Shperk or Rtsy. Unlike the mutual penetration of unspoken thoughts that he describes with them, Rozanov praises Strakhov for not attempting a false incursion on his soul:

Никто, ни даже «друг», исправить нас не сможет; но великое счастье в жизни встретить человека совсем другой конструкции, другого склада, других всех воззрений, который, всегда оставаясь собою и ни мало не вторя нам, <...> не впутываясь своею душою (и тогда притворною душою!) в нашу психологию, в нашу путаницу, в нашу мочалку, - являл-бы твердую стену и отпор нашим «глупостям» и «безумиям», какия у всякого есть. Дружба - в противоречии, а не в согласии. По-истине, Бог наградил меня как учителем Страховым: и дружба с ним, отношения к нему, всегда составляли какую-то твердую стену, о которую я чувствовал - что всегда могу на нее опереться или вернее к ней прислониться. И она не уронит и согреет.

[Lit. izg.: 208-09, n.2]<sup>69</sup>

KONSTANTIN LEONT'EV

Leont'ev was the other powerful influence on Rozanov of the previous generation of 'literary exiles'. Their correspondence took place in 1891, the year of Leont'ev's death. Over this year Rozanov read, with increasing excitement, Leont'ev's main works, but he never actually met Leont'ev. Rozanov described their relationship, in contrast to his long friendship with Strakhov, as brief and passionate. The value of their exchange was not expressed through difference, but in an urgent need for identity. Leont'ev was one of the few writers whom Rozanov innerly experienced,<sup>70</sup> like Dostoevskii and Pushkin, and who became a part of him. Rozanov claimed a passionate allegiance to Leont'ev from the start, that allowed for no such distance. Rozanov wrote: 'мы роднимся только на страстях'.<sup>71</sup> Thus points of difference were no longer a mutual intellectual enrichment as with Strakhov, but were highly impassioned: 'Все было страстно, пылко в нашем противоречии.'<sup>72</sup> This was a more intense relationship than the simple 'subjectivity' by which Rozanov distinguished the publication of the Literaturnye izgnanniki from letters like Suvorin's; thus his reactions, whether admiration, or later, repulsion, can only be violent. In 1899, Rozanov wrote about the power of Leont'ev's influence over him: 'Целый цикл моего развития был подавлен этим истинно благородным, истинно великим умом; умом - горькой правды, не умею лучше выразить. Но это безнадежная философия, без выходов, без просвета.'<sup>73</sup>

Leont'ev, like Strakhov, was isolated by the hegemony of the liberal journals. However, the style of his attack on contemporary liberal thought was very different. Both men lived hermetic, solitary lives, but for Strakhov this was a stoic scholarly attitude. He carried out his fight in clear, detached journal articles and books. Leont'ev's battle was not merely literary. Unlike Strakhov, who regretted the restrictions of a purely intellectual labour, fearing that he had never lived, Leont'ev, as Rozanov presents him, made reply to the poverty and banality of contemporary intellectual life with the gesture of his whole life. His solitude is seen as romantic and passionate: he is an 'unbridled horse', a 'man of the desert'.<sup>74</sup> He crusades against the self-satisfied hegemony of defunct liberal ideas in the name of living life. Even Leont'ev's monasticism is seen, not as a withdrawal from life, but as a withdrawal from a life no longer worthy of its name to the last reserve of aesthetic value. Leont'ev's faith is aesthetic and aristocratic. His protest was against the imminent universal mediocrity and uniformity expressed by the title of one of his articles, 'Srednii evropeets kak ideal i orudie vseirnogo razrusheniia'. Leont'ev argued that the nineteenth century pursuit of individual rights, freedom, equality, and democracy aimed at a very unheroic ideal. Its ultimate goal is the mass contentment of the average citizen. Leont'ev saw this as a mass mediocrity, his elegantly titled work was a polemic against a society which had lost its fear of God and whose

ideal was the grey, satisfied and submissive average man, passionless and godless.

Although Rozanov did not share the radical aristocraticism of Leont'ev's views (he had too much compassion for the humble and downtrodden, even for the bourgeois family contentment that Leont'ev despised), Leont'ev was an inspiration in the style of his life and writing. Rozanov did believe, as he thought that most independent thinkers with him believed, that the world was becoming increasingly dull and monotonous.<sup>75</sup> He felt the threat of 'depersonalisation' ('obezlichenie') of people and institutions in contemporary life and writing.<sup>76</sup> Like Leont'ev, he railed against the enthusiasm for Western civilization, 'торжество лакейского сегодня над веками бытия'.<sup>77</sup> It was Leont'ev's rebellion against the mediocrity and hypocrisy of 'civilized' modern life, not his aristocratic aestheticism, that attracted Rozanov.

Leont'ev represented an immense freedom. Rozanov said that, reading Leont'ev, one had the impression of entering into an immense space: 'С Леонтьевым чувствовалось, что вступаешь в «мать-кормилицу-широку-степь»'.<sup>78</sup> Conventionally received as an extreme reactionary, a little read retrograde, the radical critics would have been surprised by Rozanov's judgement that Leont'ev was the supreme representative of intellectual freedom in literature: 'самое свободомыслящее явление, может быть за все существование русской литературы'.<sup>79</sup> The intensity of his scepticism, his emotional and intellectual

independence, left far behind the seeming freedoms of other supposedly free-thinking writers, such as Solov'ev, Herzen, Radishchev and Novikov. Rozanov believed that Leont'ev was independent of the times in which he was living and of any possible audience. Leont'ev was free, capricious and despotic in his ideal, like an imperial lady in the disarray of her chamber.<sup>80</sup> Rozanov attributes this independence to an absolute 'subjectivity'.<sup>81</sup> He describes himself and Leont'ev as fellow conspirators against the self-satisfied and turgid ideas of liberalism.<sup>82</sup>

Rozanov believed that Leont'ev's freedom lay in the maintenance of his independent convictions in an activity most fraught with deception, literature. He saw in Leont'ev's writing a quality that he was later to claim for his own: 'Человек был в словах весь, как Адам без одежды.'<sup>83</sup> As discussed in the first part, the image of clothes is frequently used by Rozanov to symbolize a deceptive covering of borrowed systems or ideas, concealing a lack of original ideas. Since clothing, and the need for a covering of knowledge, is associated with the Fall, Leont'ev represents a purity prior to the Fall, where man is not ashamed to express his own ideas without the mediation of acquired knowledge: 'он был человек новый, единственный гражданин некоторого мечтаемого отечества; это - в том смысле, что он сбросил без остатка ветхую одежду западных предрассудков, верований, привычек, надежд, понятий.'<sup>84</sup> These words anticipate Gershenzon's evaluation of Rozanov's own writing.<sup>85</sup> Rozanov associated true



originality with this sense of a state of spiritual 'nakedness'. He charts man's Fall in the acquisition of knowledge and literary authorities. The Fall is symbolic of man's need to seek salvation in intellectual artifices such as theories of progress and socialism; Rozanov believed that this needless 'shame' and false covering of borrowed knowledge was the particular flaw of the Russian man.

In a letter to Leont'ev, Rozanov writes of his belief that man has almost reached the limits of his intellectual knowledge, and thus the 'Tree of Life', symbolizing the spontaneous energy of the naked Adam, has dried up:

«Человечество старо», печатали и писали в письмах Вн. Да, истощилось в произведении гениального и мудрого, героического - и осталась одна пошлость <...>. Древо жизни иссякло, потому что и к познанию окончательному уже почти близки люди. <...> я вообще заключил, что психическая деятельность истощает органическую энергию, <...> и раз что-нибудь хорошее написано, нарисовано, совершенно - некоторая доля жизни вышла из человечества, пропала в нем навсегда. Лепесток с древа жизни опал, превратившись в крупинку сахара в плоде познания. Так иссякает жизнь в исторически-деятельных народах.<sup>86</sup>

Rozanov's opavshie list'ia genre, as he explained in his work, was an attempt to gather up the leaves as they fell from this Tree. His sadness was in knowing that he could not stop this writing process that would lead inevitably to

death. But at the time of their correspondence, Rozanov hoped to have found in Leont'ev the thinker who might counteract this process. His intellectual analysis of the stages of civilization and the activity of his language seemed to penetrate the pretensions of his time. Rozanov described Leont'ev's arresting and independent writing as a pure, new birth in a tired and dissolute literary arena. He sympathized with Leont'ev's contempt for contemporary culture, as he wrote in a letter:

<...> по-моему все формы Западной цивилизации (а литература в установившемся виде - одна из них) имеют в себе этот развращенный оттенок. Ярко, ослепительно; непреодолимо очаровывает, - но и мучит внутренне несовпадением с простотой и ясностью первозданной и чистой человеческой природы.<sup>87</sup>

Leont'ev's theory of cultural development described a three-fold pattern of change, from original simplicity to a peak of complexity and diversification, reverting to a degenerate homogeneity before death. This third stage was the one that Leont'ev believed was demonstrated in modern democratic society, where the diversity and individual character of people and institutions were sacrificed to the contentment of the average mass. Although Rozanov emphasizes the isolation of Leont'ev's ideas, contemporary writings by other 'literary exiles' directly echo his theories, although without any attribution to Leont'ev; for

example, in Govorukha-Otrok's attack on progress:

Ведь, идея цивилизации есть идея усложнения, расчленения, перехода от простого к сложному; таков всегда был ход цивилизации. Простая масса усложнялась, расчленялась, и дойдя в этом своем усложнении до кульминационного пункта, эта усложнившаяся масса начинает разлагаться, то-есть, идет опять к простоте. Усложнения и расчленения мало по-малу исчезают, все смешивается в серую массу, и <...> наступает смерть, то есть, организм переходит к первоначальной неорганизованной простоте.<sup>88</sup>

Rozanov's letters to Leont'ev describe his sense of a fallen and decayed civilization. Leont'ev's own images of the stagnation of contemporary life inspired Rozanov, but they were drawn to two different ideals of escape. Leont'ev glorified the pinnacle of civilizations; the moment of extreme diversity and richness before society began to lose its variety and inwardly decay. Rozanov was drawn by beginnings, the birth of civilizations as the first forms in which a people expressed their spirit, the emergence of cults. He saw Leont'ev's attraction to Eastern cultures as an attempt to return to the emergent, formative spirit of man, untrammelled by years of intellectual production. It is the image of Leont'ev as a wild unbridled force of nature that attracts Rozanov, and not the refined and elegant aristocrat of a mature civilization. Rozanov recognized in Leont'ev a natural and uncontrollable writer,

much as he saw himself. He claimed that his own writing was an irrepressible need, a continuous process, alien to invention or formal organization. This is a guarantee of its 'literary nakedness'. He attributes the same qualities to Leont'ev. He describes Leont'ev's writing as an elemental force and praises Leont'ev's freedom from the reader, as a guarantee of the purity, the absence of poses, mannerism or false clothing in Leont'ev's writing:

<...> я уже ясно видел, что имею перед собой человека безмерной внутренней силы, тонкой, не ошибающейся проницательности и совершенно не стесняющегося ничьим присутствием. Читатель, конечно, стоит где-то в стороне, но Вы его не видите - и разговариваете с собой. От этого невыразимая прелесть языка Вашего, этих отрывочных, сухих и точных фраз.<sup>89</sup>

Чувствуется, что здесь - натура пишущего, которой некуда спрятаться, с которым он не может совладать, когда даже и хотел бы, <...> и в глубине души своей, он с ней не хочет даже совладать - как вода струящаяся, живая, никогда не захочет остановиться.<sup>90</sup>

Rozanov saw Leont'ev's language as exemplary of his uncompromising intellectual power: 'Ваш язык, сухой, точный, как бы сталью подрезывающий каждый предмет и подводящий под него пленку именно нужной толщины <...> я множество страниц перечитывал по многу раз, именно ради

языка, любясь им.'<sup>91</sup> Indeed, Leont'ev's bold literary style, as well as his ideas, had a powerful impact on Rozanov. Ivask notes the similarities between the two writers' use of dashes, bold type, and a conversational tone, also a similar sense of writing 'for oneself', although he believes that Leont'ev would have probably viewed with distaste the familiar tones that Rozanov began to develop at the start of the century.<sup>92</sup>

Rozanov believed that Leont'ev's writing was a revivifying force in a word-weary society. He urged Leont'ev to recognize the nature of his gift, which was in the nature of the Biblical prophets, and not that of contemporary literature, by using the former as his example:

Нет, знайте и помните, что Вы влиятельнее всех нас, т.е. и Страхова, и Соловьева, и Говорухи-Отрока, и Астафьева, и меня; только Вам самим из Оптиной Пустыни это незаметно. Поэтому напрасно Вы взяли эпитафьи из Вл. Герье и посвятили книгу свою Т. Филиппову, - это к Вам не идет. Берите эпитафьи из Библии, из Евангелия, из Пророков, и пишите, думая лишь о них.<sup>93</sup>

Leont'ev was a little known figure to his Russian contemporaries, yet Rozanov argues that he was a phenomenon on the scale of Nietzsche. He recognized the similarities of their ideas instantly, when he first read a Russian article about the German philosopher. He calls Nietzsche

and Leont'ev two halves of a single comet, one of which fell in Germany and the other in Russia, and writes: 'Но как различна судьба, в смысле признания. Одним шумит Европа, другой - как бы неморожденный, точно ничего не сказавший даже в своем отечестве.'<sup>94</sup>

Rozanov claimed that Leont'ev was more Nietzschean than Nietzsche himself.<sup>95</sup> Nietzsche's rebellion remained a purely literary phenomenon, an object of intellectual delectation for European readers which would not threaten to transform their lives: 'его антиморализм, антихристианство все же были лишь <...> литературной вещью, только помазавшей по губам европейского человечества'.<sup>96</sup> By contrast, Leont'ev's 'Nietzscheanism' was a monstrous appetite. Rozanov believes that if he had achieved power he would have brought about a revolution in Europe with blood and fire. Nietzsche's daring remained intellectual, made from the safe confines of a study and a scholarly career. Europe loved Nietzsche because in his life he conformed to existing tradition. His challenge was purely literary: 'Он очень хорошо уместился в рамках этой цивилизации, нисколько с нею не разоидясь. Отсюда и признание его, такое шумное и скорое после смерти, во всей Европе. Европа признала в Ницше «своего человека», хорошего буржуа и доброго лютеранина.'<sup>97</sup> Rozanov believed that Nietzsche even reinforced the bourgeois intellectuals' sense of security, by providing a justification for their lack of religious impulse. Religious indifference could be masked as intellectual daring. Leont'ev is a wild and

uncompromising spirit, free of the passionless intellectualism of the European intelligentsia and even their most daring philosopher, Nietzsche. He was too advanced for the taste of the Russian reading public, who sought a more simple morality:

<...> он восстал против всего движения европейской цивилизации, христианской культуры. Конечно, это был титан, в сравнении с которым Ницше был просто немецким профессором, ибо Ницше и в голову не приходило остановить цивилизацию или повернуть цивилизацию: он писал просто книги <...>.

<...> По-моему, он стоял выше Ницше и был неизмеримо героичнее его, потому именно, что отнюдь не был «литератор», а практический боец, и так понимал всю свою личность, всю свою деятельность...<sup>98</sup>

Но это был Ницше не в литературе, а Ницше в действии. То, что он остался отвергнутым и не признанным, даже почти не прочитанным (публикой), и свидетельствует о страшной новизне Леонтьева. Он был «не по зубам» нашему обществу, которое «охаёт» и «ухаёт» то около морали Толстого, то около героев Горького и Л. Андреева.<sup>99</sup>

Rozanov valued Leont'ev's criticism of the over-literary nature of society, his enthusiasm for the lovers of life, heroes and warriors rather than literary heroes. Like Rozanov, Leont'ev had an ambiguous attitude to Russian

literature, a combination of deep love and repulsion. He too saw Russian society as paralysed and emasculated by its predominantly literary culture. He wrote: 'Я давно уже не могу любить «страстно» литературу. Без хорошей литературы все-таки можно всячески жить.'<sup>100</sup> However, both men are 'writers by nature', neither could avoid literary activity.

Like Rozanov, Leont'ev's attitude to Russian literature showed the influence of Apollon Grigor'ev's 'organic' school of criticism. His work on Tolstoi, 'Analiz, stil', veianie', makes use of Grigor'ev's concept of the predominant 'atmosphere' ('veianie') for a highly aesthetic estimation of the writer's work.<sup>101</sup> Both Rozanov and Leont'ev were iconoclastic in their view of Gogol'. They both accused him of depicting soulless, monstrous, and not human characters. Leont'ev praised Rozanov for his daring in his writing on Gogol'.<sup>102</sup> They differed sharply, however, over Dostoevskii. Leont'ev found the psychologism, the 'poking about in the soul', and religious views of Dostoevskii antipathetic. Leont'ev revealed to Rozanov Solov'ev's conviction that Dostoevskii was unable to believe in God,<sup>103</sup> although Rozanov had himself already expressed this view to Strakhov.<sup>104</sup> Like Rozanov, he had immense admiration for Dostoevskii's Dnevnik pisatelja, which he preferred to the novels. All three writers were repelled by the deformation and disfigurement of contemporary civilization, but whereas Rozanov and Dostoevskii saw the answer as a transcendence that would originate from within the chaos, Leont'ev sought a



controlled aesthetic order, although not without mysticism. Leont'ev's polemic against a rational harmony of men on earth is as incisive as Dostoevskii's attack on the Crystal Palace in Zapiski iz podpol'ia. He too recognized that man's nature is perverse and uncharted and defied rational organization. However, Dostoevskii and Rozanov shared a combination of attraction to the miserable and downtrodden, to the shambolic byways of thought and life, together with a vague dream of a future harmony that repelled Leont'ev. Leont'ev dismissed this dream as Dostoevskii's 'rose-coloured Christianity'. Leont'ev was a radical aristocrat, who believed in tyranny, and the necessity for impoverishment to achieve artistic and military glories. Rozanov argued that this was a supremely aesthetic position, and that Leont'ev's reactionary politics were not inherent:

<...> в скорлупу своего жестокого консерватизма Леонтьев заперся только с отчаяния, прячась как великий эстет, от потока мещанских идей и мещанских фактов своего времени и надвигающегося будущего. И следовательно если бы его (Л-ва) рыцарскому сердцу было вдали показано что-нибудь и не консервативное, даже радикальное - и вместе с тем однако не мещанское, не плоское, не пошлое - то он рванулся бы к нему со всей силой своего - позволю сказать - гения.<sup>105</sup>

Leont'ev encouraged Rozanov in a sense of intellectual alliance, he wrote to him: 'родственность мысли я чувствую

на каждом *mary'*.<sup>106</sup> There are indeed important parallels between the two writers' sympathies, if not in their ideas. Leont'ev expresses a similar attitude to Rozanov towards reading philosophy in a letter to him: 'Большую часть, по философским книгам только «порхаю» с какой-нибудь своей затаенной «тенденцией»; ищу - и порхаю <...> как какая-нибудь шершавая пчела'.<sup>107</sup> This passage is very close to Rozanov's own remarks about reading in his footnotes of 1913 to Strakhov's letters.<sup>108</sup> Like Rozanov, Leont'ev valued silence, and noted the disparity between thoughts and their verbal expression: 'Молчание не всегда есть признак безсодержательности. G. Sand хорошо называла иных людей, исполненных ума и души, но не одаренных умением выразить свою внутреннюю жизнь, *les grands muets'*.<sup>109</sup>

Rozanov characteristically pays attention to Leont'ev's handwriting:

Нужно бы приложить снимки с почерка его, - этого женского почерка, с едва выраженным нажимом пера, лежащего <...>, с тонкими, почти острыми загибами букв, с подчеркиваниями слов и иногда в слове только слогов, которые будто слышались, как произносит он резким отрывающим голосом, <...>. Этот почерк был очень похож на стиль его (каллиграфически изображал его), нервный и острый, страстный и мучительный...<sup>110</sup>

Although Leont'ev shared Rozanov's enthusiasm for the spoken and handwritten forms of expression rather than

printed literature, he resists Rozanov's enthusiastic attempt to make his preference for writing personal letters over articles for the press into a philosophical principle: 'это было вовсе не в таком идеальном смысле, в каком вы это понимаете <...>. Поэтому не приписывайте мне тех целомудренных чувств, которые вы в себе сознаете. Я их не сознаю в себе, а напротив того, очень люблю видеть свои труды в печати.'<sup>111</sup>

Rozanov believed that the attention to physical details was fundamental to Leont'ev's outlook and he was eager to find confirmation of his own value for physiognomy in a writer that he so admired. Leont'ev answered Rozanov's request for a photograph and made it the occasion of an analysis of wrinkles as indicators of character.<sup>112</sup> In a footnote to the published letter, Rozanov reacts with enthusiasm to Leont'ev's attention to physical detail, seeing it as proof that Leont'ev's insight was superior to Strakhov's: 'Как все замечено! Какая наблюдательность! Страхову или Рачинскому просто не пришло бы на ум посмотреть на это. Иное дело эстету Л-ву: ему дай лицо и затем начинай «о душе».'<sup>113</sup> In his reply, thanking Leont'ev for his portrait, Rozanov echoes Leont'ev's attention to the significance of wrinkles: 'морщинка над носом, прямым и сухим - [говорит] о строгости суждений Ваших, не ошибающихся и не колеблющихся'.<sup>114</sup>

Rozanov's letters to Leont'ev were written in 1891, when Rozanov was still heavily under the influence of Leont'ev's ideas. Yet he soon recognized a fatal flaw in

Leont'ev's theories. In an article of 1895, Rozanov argued that Leont'ev's aestheticism was deadly, as it blinded him to what was essential in man. Leont'ev could perceive only external forms and was shut out from human warmth. His ideas, though brilliant, were wrong:

Леонтьев не имел в будущем надежд; но это оттого, что, заботясь о людях, страшась за них, он, в сущности, не видел в них единственного, за что их можно было бы уважать - и не уважал. <...> он не ощущал вкуса и к человеку - иного, чем какой мог ощутить к его одежде, к красоте его движений, к подобному... Странная пассивность всех отношений к действительности - что зовут его «реакционерством» - была уже естественным плодом этого.<sup>115</sup>

In an extended passage in Opavshie list'ia Rozanov reacts against his early enthusiasm for Leont'ev.<sup>116</sup> He is deeply critical of his ideas and religious beliefs, and claims that Leont'ev's religion was merely a source for attacks on the nineteenth century bourgeois and his 'positivist' fetishes: 'Его не тянуло (нисколько!) к себе христианство, но он увидел здесь неистощимый арсенал стрел «против подлого буржуа XIX-го века».' [O. 1.II: 319]

In his Mimoletnoe of 1915, Rozanov wrote that he regretted this outburst, calling it a 'sin'.<sup>117</sup> He writes of Leont'ev as standing above the other Slavophiles like a 'morose, eternal cliff',<sup>118</sup> and praised him as the greatest thinker of the nineteenth century, whose letters proved him to be

the greatest writer also: 'письма его (к Александрову, в Бог. в., только что прочел) являют вообще по необыкновенной чистоте и благородству души - что-то праведное. По качеству «Писем» - это 1-й писатель России за XIX в.'<sup>119</sup>

Yet the fundamental difference between the two men, so attracted to one another in literary and stylistic matters, was in their attitude towards religion and man. Leont'ev was contemptuous of the humanitarian impulse, claiming that socialist theories were the result of a fatal over-veneration of man. He believed that love for man must be founded on fear of God. Rozanov was far more compassionate towards man, even in his prosaic and banal aspects. Rozanov valued man's impulse towards God more than God. A man's religious attitude was for him the determining source of all other characteristics. Leont'ev wrote that God was more important, and this caused Rozanov to doubt the entire basis of Leont'ev's religious belief. Rozanov's subjective and emotive religious approach, seeking religion above all as a comfort and warmth, contrasted with Leont'ev's austerity and emphasis on holy fear as the most important religious attitude.<sup>120</sup> Rozanov interprets Leont'ev's austerity as being less a religious than an aesthetic attitude. He explains Leont'ev's adoption of Orthodox monasticism as a search for aesthetic quietism. He describes him as a Russian dandy, adopting a proud and solitary gesture of mourning, an austere aestheticism, in protest at the ugly self-satisfaction of an increasingly bourgeois culture. Rozanov believes that Leont'ev lacked an

inner sense of religion, as faith and instinct. He argues that Leont'ev's religious sense extended only to the forms of religion and thus was imposed from without. The aesthetic force that is so much the strength of Leont'ev's language and thought becomes the enemy of powerful verbal expression when faced with religion, an impulse that Rozanov believes he does not truly understand or feel:

Но вот мы подходим к религии... какая связанность языка, скудость воображения, вялость письма и мышления! <...> В речи, которая не умеет более играть, потеряла жизнь свою, он приводит соответствующие делу канонизированные слова - и только; что-то формально-внешнее, извне требующее, непонятно господствующее - для него религия.<sup>121</sup>

Сам Леонтьев был, так сказать, беспощадный эстет. Монашество взяло только под свою мантию, но не «забрало за душу», как выражаются.<sup>122</sup>

Thus Leont'ev belies Rozanov's hopes that he could be a new prophet, an active and creative force to re-enliven religious language. He cannot be a prophet, despite the power of his language, because when approaching the essential, his language pales, becomes passive and bland, it lacks the incisive and outraged energy of conviction with which he is impelled to address the ruins he sees around him in contemporary society and culture. The power of Leont'ev's writing, his longing and passion, is all

directed at the loss of earthly beauty. Prophecy demands an active and creative impulse of faith, but Leont'ev's religious attitude was one of quietude and submission. Leont'ev was as acute as Rozanov to the hypocritical 'nominalism' of ossified thought and inert language that was part of the atrophy of contemporary civilization, but in the end Rozanov claimed that he was powerless to enact the spiritual transformation that Rozanov had believed him capable of. He did not have enough optimism about man and sought refuge from the world rather than trying to overcome it. Rozanov argues that this absence of religious feeling is the source of Leont'ev's contempt and cynicism about man. He does not believe in the one redeeming quality in man's weakness, his need for religion. Religion remained a formal refuge for Leont'ev's aesthetic values: 'Он <...> бежал в последнее убежище эстетики наших дней - в черный монастырь с его упорным отрицанием жизни. «Мантии монахов все-таки эстетичнее виц-мундира чиновника и клетчатого пиджака берлинского или питерского буржуа».'<sup>123</sup> Rozanov complains that in this sphere alone, the impassioned warrior was passive, his powerful language was muted.

Despite his aesthetic aversion to bourgeois domesticity, Leont'ev did express concern, like Rozanov, for the religious ideal of family life. He lamented the weakness of strong family ideals in Russia in contrast to Europe, and the poverty of the depiction of the family in Russian literature. He believed that the strength of the Russian family lay in Orthodox religion.<sup>124</sup> For Rozanov,

however, the family was the source of religion, a fact that the Church did its best to avoid. The religion of family life that Rozanov praised and described in his books emerged spontaneously from the very domestic cosiness that Leont'ev would have despised. This was Rozanov's central argument against Leont'ev, that his aestheticism would not permit him a love of these more ordinary, and for Rozanov, sacred, details. As he wrote in Opavshie list'ia: 'Увы, молятся всегда «среднею буржуазною молитвою» - молитвой «европейца в пиджаке».' [O. l. I: 315] Rozanov had great compassion for precisely these attempts at goodness of the insignificant average man, the unheroic family man whom Leont'ev despised. Rozanov came to see the freedom that he had been attracted to in Leont'ev as an evasion of real life. While drawn to the boldness of Leont'ev's argument, he was too much in sympathy with the humble and essentially bourgeois values so alien to Leont'ev, seeing these as the truly heroic reality.<sup>125</sup>

Rozanov distanced himself from both Nietzsche and Leont'ev, with whom his ideas had been associated, by emphasizing his ordinariness, and timidity, which does not deny his potential for extraordinary ideas.

С Ницше... никакого сходства! С Леонтьевым - никакого же личного (сход.). Я только люблю его. Но сходство и «люблю» - разное.

Я самый обыкновенный человек; позвольте полный титул: «Коллежский советник Василий Васильевич Розанов, пишущий



сочинения».

Теперь эти «сочинения»... Да, мне много пришло на ум, чего раньше никому не приходило, в том числе и Ницше, и Леонтьеву. <...> Я - добрый и малый (parvus) <...> Это мое положение, но не я. От этого я считаю себя, что «в Боге»...

[Ued.: 151]

Rozanov finds refuge in 'prayer and pain', a different sort of prayer to Leont'ev's. For Rozanov, this is a soft-hearted compassion for the small ordinary man like himself, for his weakness rather than any cult of strength: 'дело в кротости, что я был именно и всегда кроткий, тихий, послушный, миролюбивый человек. «Как все»'. [Ued.: 154]

Yet despite distancing himself personally from Leont'ev, Rozanov remained influenced by his theories. In an article of 1913 for Novoe vremia, Rozanov again reveals Leont'ev's influence in his analysis of the fading of the planet, the drying up of poetry and the spread of socialism. He echoes once more Leont'ev's description of a third phase of degeneration, characterized by a bid at social and economic equality, in which a culture's vital energies withdraw and coalesce. He relates his words to an engineer on the journey home from a visit to a monastery:

Планета наша вообще сжимается, как старичок, которому «стукнуло 70 лет». Поэзия вообще увядает, и не лично увядает, а вот планетно увядает, <...> социализм характерно выражает это старческое вырождение всей планеты, упорно и

сумасшедше сводя «жизнь» к экономическому расчету...

<...> Жизнь стала несрисовываема и невоспеваема.<...>  
Вообще невоспеваема!...<sup>126</sup>

Yet Rozanov's solution to this planetary dessication and cooling was in a religion of warmth, human weakness and ordinary domesticity that would have repelled Leont'ev. Rozanov made use of Leont'ev's theories in order to promote his own, quite contradictory, ideas. Rozanov sees Leont'ev as a thinker condemned by his own ideas. As with Strakhov, the article that he writes a few years after Leont'ev's death pronounces him to be 'wrong':

Он во всем ошибся; он ошибся - мы повторяем без всякой боли о его памяти. <...> Благородный и истинно великий, он нес свои идеи как тягость, как болезнь; и очень печальна судьба, что ложность этой болезни, призрачность этой тягости становится ясна так поздно, что уже не может прозвучать для него облегчающею вестью.<sup>127</sup>

Rozanov argued that Leont'ev's nature would have been more suited to the renewed contemplative, aesthetic and mystical atmosphere that penetrated society soon after his death:

Он (Л-в) не дожил, немногих лет, до нового поворота идей, вкусов и поэзии в нашем обществе, которое охватывается в одну скобку «декаденства», - и, думается, самую

неожиданностью своею, своими порывами вдаль, своими религиозными влечениями и симпатиями к древнему Востоку - вероятно охватило бы его душу как «последняя и смертельная любовь». Не знаю, обманывает ли меня вкус: но чувствуется мне, что он был «декадентом» раньше, чем появилось самое это имя <...>.<sup>128</sup>

Нельзя не обратить внимания, что как с идеями Л-ва роднит с одной стороны Ницше, так с его вкусами удивительно совпадают так называемые «эстеты», «декаденты», «символисты» и проч. Мне известно (из личных знакомств), что они даже и не заглядывали в Л-ва, прямо не знают о существовании его. Между тем коренная его мысль, сердцевинный пафос - порыв к эстетике житейских форм, к мистицизму и неисповедимости житейской сути - суть в то же время надпись на поднятом ими знамени. Замечательно, что почти сейчас после его смерти (в 1891 г.) явилось шумное, яркое, самоуверенное движение в сторону «красивых форм жизни»; зашумели Рескин, Ницше, Метерлинк, наши «декаденты». И вот тут-то выразился роковой *fatum* Л-ва, что то движение, которое он так страстно призывал всю свою жизнь, когда родилось, пришло, почти победило, - то даже и не назвало его по имени. Это действительно поразительно <...> и не виною ли просто журналы, в которых он участвовал и которых никто не читал??<sup>129</sup>

Rozanov believed that Leont'ev would have found enthusiastic readers had he lived to see the new aesthetic

and psychological enthusiasms at the turn of the century.<sup>130</sup> Instead he was forced to seek a refuge for his aesthetic principles in a monastery, without gaining influence or followers. Rozanov believed that Leont'ev's writings were 'like letters to the wrong address', they lacked the receptive readers who would have recognized his greatness and originality. Thus the essential energy of his thought, that could have been a great force for renewal was stifled by the dessicating pessimism of his ideas that developed in reaction to the unreceptive time in which he was writing.<sup>131</sup>

#### VLADIMIR SOLOV'EV

Rozanov was particularly drawn to figures seemingly at odds with their time, those who did not follow the fashion of an intellectual mood, but whose character and ideas stood out in contrast to the age, and perhaps revealed more engaging complexities than if they had lived in a time more receptive to their thought. Vladimir Solov'ev, as well as Leont'ev, shows this complexity. Both men occupied a transitional position in the rapidly changing intellectual climate of the decades between 1860 and 1900. Rozanov linked Solov'ev and Leont'ev in his afterword to the publication of Leont'ev's letters.<sup>132</sup> He argued that both men could have thrived in a great era but were paralysed by the banal and uncreative circumstances of contemporary life, and the energy of their genius turned against them.

Rozanov writes of them: 'Немного в истории русской есть таких грустных и изящных лиц'.<sup>133</sup>

Solov'ev, unlike Leont'ev, was not a 'literary exile'; he was published, successful, and in many ways represented for Rozanov the repellent aspects of contemporary journalism. Rozanov was perhaps more damning in his remarks about Solov'ev than about any other writer. However, as Viktor Sukach notes in the introduction to the recent republication of Rozanov's article 'Avtoportret Vl. S. Solov'eva', Rozanov devotes an unparalleled amount of attention to Solov'ev.<sup>134</sup> Over the period 1894-1916, he engages with Solov'ev's personality or work in more than 25 articles and notes, more than with any other individual. Rozanov may have been critical of Solov'ev's ideas and his literary persona, but he seems to have been compelled by the figure of Solov'ev: 'В Соловьеве главное, «заповедное» - его личность, которая притягивает гораздо более его «сочинений»'.<sup>135</sup>

Rozanov could be deeply scathing about Solov'ev. In Opavshie list'ia, he grouped him together with Rachinskii and Tolstoi, as writers he was unable to feel sympathy for:

Последняя собака, раздавленная трамваем, вызывала большее движение души, чем их «философия и публицистика» (устно). Эта «раздавленная собака», пожалуй, кое-что объясняет. Во всех трех не было абсолютно никакой «раздавленности», напротив, сами они весьма и весьма «давили» (полемика, враги и пр.). <...> Как я любил и люблю Страхова, любил и

люблю К. Леонтьева; не говоря о «мелочах жизни», которые люблю безмерно. <...> любить можно то, или - того, о ком сердце болит. О всех трех не было никакой причины «душе болеть», и от этого я их не любил.

[O. 1. I: 174-75]

In his more reflective statements, Rozanov did, however, see Solov'ev as an intellectual exile, who had suffered from the dominance of radical thought that marked the universities as well the press. Strakhov and Leont'ev are true 'literary exiles' who lacked literary recognition. Solov'ev was a prolific and widely-read journalist and provoked a more complicated reaction. Yet the universities were as fraught as journalism with fashionable ideologies, personal politics and power moves that had little to do with the search for truth. Both Strakhov and Solov'ev were isolated from philosophical activity in the universities of Moscow and St Petersburg, which was dominated by the empiricist Troitskii. Their immense potential was wasted:

<...> в то время, как неспособный к философии Троицкий «распространялся» с министерской кафедры, само министерство поручило способнейшему Страхову до утомления, до тошноты разбирать учебники по естественной истории для реальных училищ; а Владимира Соловьева, тоже идеалиста, не пускало в университет, потому что «он имеет мысли» <...> Бросим и по-истине плюнем на это гадкое место русской истории.

[Lit. izg.: 137-38, n.1]

<...> просто передвижение Страхова и Соловьева (Влад.) на философские кафедры в Москве и Петербурге, - в ту-то пору! - составило бы эпоху в университетах, в судьбах русской философии, и - самое главное! - в добром наставлении русского юношества <...>.

[Lit. izg.: 157, n.1].

Rozanov recognized the importance of Solov'ev's contribution to Russian philosophy and in his article of 1890, 'Zametka o vazhneishikh techeniakh russkoi filosofskoi mysli v sviazi s nashei perevodnoi literaturoi po filosofii', he claimed that Solov'ev had done more than anyone else to free Russian philosophical thought from the impasse of positivist and empiricist influence.<sup>136</sup> In 1904, Rozanov wrote that Solov'ev was the first real Russian philosopher, since he engaged with ideas themselves, and not the compilation of others' ideas:

Все они, русские философы до Соловьева, были как бы отделами энциклопедического словаря по предмету философии, без всякого интереса и без всякого решительного взгляда на что бы то ни было. Соловьев, можно сказать, разбил эту собирательную и бездушную энциклопедию и заменил ее правильной и единоличной книгой, местами даже книгой страстной. По этому одному он и стал «философом».<sup>137</sup>

Rozanov praised the energy of Solov'ev's intellect, 'Острый, волнующийся, вечно досадающий ум Вл.

Соловьева',<sup>138</sup> that focused religious and philosophical interest on Russian reality. On Solov'ev's death, Rozanov blamed political manoeuvring for squandering his philosophical ability and turning him into an anti-Russian publicist:

И «не нужный» философ пошел в продолжительное скитальчество, может быть, раздраженный, наверно опечаленный; и может быть, много горьких и ошибочных слов, слов желчных и несправедливых вырывалось у него как ответ на это «не надо»... Они не только устранили превосходного религиозного, серьезного руководителя молодых колеблющихся умов, но и создали многолетнего и талантливейшего бойца против консервативных начал жизни, анти-славянофила, анти-руссиста.<sup>139</sup>

Rozanov associated Solov'ev's activity with the 'public square', the 'street' and 'noise' of the publicists, so alien to the true spirit of Russian writing as sustained by quiet and hidden 'literary exiles'. In a footnote to one of Strakhov's letters, Rozanov contrasts the two environments, associating Solov'ev decisively with the destructive world of newspapers, journals, scandal and social democracy:

<...> семья связанных друг с другом людей, <...>. Вот божественный порядок, божественная тишина, божественный труд. И совсем другое - улица, гам, клуб, кокотка,



писатель. Здесь - демоническое безделье, или если «дело» - то злобное, разрушительное, кого-нибудь опрокидывающее, что-нибудь разрушающее, подо что-нибудь подкапывающееся. У Соловьева не было ни «иоты» от тишины.

[Lit. izq.: 144, n.2]<sup>140</sup>

Rozanov complained about Solov'ev's writing style in a letter to Leont'ev:

Во Вл. Соловьеве мне не нравится эта напряженность языка, эта торопливость; а его последние писания, простите за откровенность, мне просто противны <...>.

Но, конечно, его разнообразие привлекательно <...> Как я любил его, когда еще будучи гимназистом - узнал о его выступлении против позитивистов, но с каждым годом он становится менее и менее интересен.

Может быть, я очень ошибаюсь, но думаю так: его имя никогда не будет забыто, в истории нашей литературы, так он много нашумел, но его сочинения очень скоро перестанут читаться после его смерти.<sup>141</sup>

Rozanov believed that the energy that impelled Solov'ev lacked a secure ground on which to thrive and bear fruit. This letter anticipates Rozanov's future criticisms of Solov'ev, his speed and noise, exemplifying the world of publishing and print that Rozanov sought to overcome. Rozanov explained Solov'ev's success in his polemic with Strakhov as owing merely to his superior journalistic

position with the powerful liberal journals:

Почти не нужно договаривать, что в споре шум победы был на стороне С-ва, а истина победы была на стороне Страхова. Но Страхов писал в «Русском Вестнике», которого никто не читал, а Соловьев - в «Вестник Европы», который был у каждого профессора и у каждого чиновника на столе.

[Lit. izq.: 130, n.1]

Rozanov claimed that Solov'ev exploited the polemic to gain an easy popularity. He describes Strakhov as yet another martyr to true thought: 'Да, это мученики русской мысли: и в полемике со Страховым «торжествующий» Соловьев с его тоном «всегдашнего победителя» был мучителем.' [Lit. izq.: 141, n.2] In the impassioned Mimoletnoe of 1915, Rozanov reacted against his early admiration for Solov'ev's philosophical achievements, and claimed that Solov'ev had proved himself to be neither a philosopher or genuine thinker but a 'writer', in the most pejorative sense:

<...> философия - прибежище тишины и тихих душ, спокойных, созерцательных и наслаждающихся созерцанием умов. Соловьев же весь б. шум и нельзя отрицать - даже суета. Самолюбие его было всепоглощающее: какой же это философ? Он был ПИСАТЕЛЬ - с огромным вливом литературных волнений своих, литературного темперамента - в философию.<sup>142</sup>

Rozanov writes that Solov'ev's antipathy or

indifference to the traditions of Russian thought that he most valued was perhaps his most ominous characteristic. Solov'ev has failed to fulfil his early promise of making a unique contribution to Russian thought. Rozanov laments Solov'ev's lack of attachment to Russia, and Russian originality:

Дело в том и тайна в том, что Вл. Соловьев <...> был таинственным и трагическим образом совершенно не русский, не имея даже иоты «русского» в физическом очерке лица и фигуры. <...> Как странным образом он «не осязал» и русской земли, полей, лесов, <...>.

Отсюда его расхождения, напр., со Страховым, Данилевским, Ив. С. Аксаковым, с «памятью Киреевского и Хомякова» - имели особенный и для меня по крайней мере страшный характер. Он и когда «сходил»ся, «дружил», «знакомился» с ними, ничего к ним ровно не чувствовал; и разойдясь - не чувствовал боли, страдания.<sup>143</sup>

Действительно, это - замечательно не русский, а международный, европейский писатель. Тут есть - и качество, но есть - и явный недостаток. [Lit. izg.: 130, n.1]

Rozanov describes Solov'ev as a 'wanderer', who could not attach himself to people, places or ideas.<sup>144</sup> He lacks a 'home', both in physical surroundings and in the ideological climate in which he was writing. This was the antithesis of what Rozanov was seeking in his writing. Yet

Rozanov believed that Solov'ev might have found an intellectual 'home' in the optimistic 1860s, where he would have been able to put the energy of his writing into deeds. Despite Solov'ev's historic attack on positivism in philosophy, Rozanov believes that the reforming zeal of the 1860s was fundamental to his nature: 'В образе мыслей его, а особенно в приемах его жизни и деятельности, была бездна «шестидесятых годов», и нельзя сомневаться, что хотя в «Кризисе западной философии» и выступил он «против позитивизма», т.е. против них, - он их однако горячо любил и уважал, любил именно как «родное», «свое».'<sup>145</sup>

Losev praised Rozanov's intuition about Solov'ev's inheritance from the 1860s, while expressing surprise that Rozanov, the 'decadent' and literary exhibitionist, should be capable of such subtle perceptions about Solov'ev's most essential characteristics.<sup>146</sup> However, Losev might see that there was not so great a contradiction if he admitted that Rozanov's 'decadence' was eccentric, and more complicated than that of many of his contemporaries. The radical writers of the 1860s were Rozanov's formative intellectual enthusiasm, although he later condemned positivism and all its practitioners. Both Solov'ev and Rozanov admired action and deeds rather than words. They shared a strong enthusiasm for the spirit if not the letter of the 1860s. For this reason they both admired Leont'ev, whom they recognized as essentially a man of deeds rather than a literary figure, and condemned Nietzsche as a practically ineffective and unheroic scholar. Yet despite their

enthusiasm for heroic action, both men were more at home with the verbal rhetoric and devices of journalistic polemics than they would have liked to admit. They were excitable in print and could be carried away by their style. Strakhov compared the excesses of Rozanov's literary expansiveness to Solov'ev's writing:

Разве не похоже? Разве не даровитый человек, разве дурно владеет словами? Но неисцелимая путаница мысли, не дающая ничему созреть и сложиться, сумбур всяких слов и мыслей - погубили все плоды, которые мог бы принести этот талант.

[Lit. izg.: 349]

Rozanov would not have welcomed the comparison. He was acute to the faults of Solov'ev's journalistic style, and criticized his tendency to hysteria and artless word-play. Solov'ev's writing had elements of pedantry that Leont'ev called his 'progressive jesuitry',<sup>147</sup> but Rozanov saw it as above all the polemic style of a publicist, proof more of verbal display than of mature, concentrated thought. Rozanov condemns Solov'ev's literary polemics for the tone in which he attempts to undermine things that are sacred to Russia for the sake of a literary victory: 'Его полемика с Данилевским, со Страховым, с (пусть нелепыми) «российскими радикал-реалистами», с русскими богословами, с «памятью Аксакова, Каткова и Хомякова» до того чудовищна по низкому, неблагородному, самонадеянно-высокомерному тону, по отвратительно газетному языку'.<sup>148</sup>

In Posle Sakharny, Rozanov even claimed that Solov'ev's talent was an illusion: 'Везде он был очень талантливый, но ёрник. В сущности и не талантливый, а «очень скоро бегающий». Эти его быстро бегающие ножки были приняты за талант и он был сочтен «русским Оригеном»'.<sup>149</sup> Rozanov distinguished his own success from that of the 'literary exiles' with the same image of facility in writing, 'Суть «меня» в том, что у меня тоже выросло «5 ног»'.<sup>150</sup> Legs are an image of adeptness in the complex literary arena (in the same passage, Chernyshevskii is also noted for having 'five legs'). Rozanov is aware, as Solov'ev was similarly aware, that both he and Solov'ev show an unusual and individual skill for journalism.

Rozanov was particularly acute to the elements of pose in Solov'ev. He describes Solov'ev as creating a mask of buffoonery and wit to protect against any intrusion into his private thoughts:

Все напечатанное пока увековечивает ту гипсовую маску, которую всегда носил философ, - маску, расписанную шутками, фарсами, гримасами, буффонадой, какие так густо одевали Соловьева и крепко закрывали от глаза «непосвященного». В самом деле, в Соловьеве надо было «посвящаться»... И ни для кого «чужого» он не снимал маски и шутливого, почти шутовского плаща.<sup>151</sup>

The reference to Solov'ev's laughter, mask and cloak have demonic implications. Rozanov consciously used this demonic

imagery to conjure up an ominous portrait of the publicist for his readers. Rozanov emphasizes the sinister quality of Solov'ev's laugh, to which he made repeated reference: 'Вл. Соловьев на тот же вопрос саркастически разсмеялся, своим ледяным антипатетичным смехом, громким и металлическим'<sup>152</sup> In a footnote to one of Strakhov's letters, Rozanov explicitly associates Solov'ev's laugh with his demonism:<sup>153</sup>

Он весь был блестящий, холодный, стальной (поразительный стальной смех у него - кажется Толстой выразился: «ужасный смех Соловьева») ... Может быть в нем было «божественное» (как он претендовал) или - по моему определению - глубоко демоническое, именно преисподнее: но ничего или очень мало в нем было человеческого. «Сына человеческого» (по-житейскому) в нем даже и не начиналось, - и, казалось, сюда относится вечное тайное оплакивание им себя, что я в нем непрерывно чувствовал во время личного знакомства. Соловьев был странный, многоодаренный и страшный человек.

[Lit. izg.: 142, n.2]

Blok claimed that Solov'ev's laugh had a seemingly magical and self-protective force. He wrote in a letter to Chulkov: 'смех делает Соловьева совершенно неуязвимым от тех нападок Розанова, которые звучат похоронно'.<sup>154</sup> Rozanov claimed to detect a sadness in Solov'ev, in the ambiguity of his laugh: 'Какой странный у него был этот смех, шумный и может-быть маскирующий постоянную грусть.'<sup>155</sup> Losev

praised Rozanov's perception of Solov'ev's sadness.<sup>156</sup> Rozanov believed that it stemmed from his sense of isolation from others, it was the sadness of a remote and selfish ego.

Rozanov's characterization of Solov'ev contains repeated images of devilry and demonism. In a review of the first publication of Solov'ev's letters in 1908 he describes the 'frenzied dance' of Solov'ev's language:

И нет письма, где не кружился бы в судорожной пляске эта вокабулярная истерика. <...> Точно его что несет. И он хотел бы удержаться за предметы, за идеи своими прозрачными, тонкими пальцами, но точно внутренний вихрь отрывал его от них, и он уносился далее, далее <...>.<sup>157</sup>

Rozanov argued that Solov'ev used a sort of verbal trickery to avoid any self-revelation even in this intimate genre of the letter. Solov'ev's use of words distances him from the world of people and things. Words do not renew the connection with the world, as they did for Rozanov, but perform their own devilish dance. For Rozanov, this was a sin against the nature of the word. As he wrote in the Mimoletnoe for 1915, Solov'ev's words do not flow out of him organically, unlike Rozanov's, which he claimed were mixed with human blood and seed, but have been put together artificially:

Он только «касается перстами» жизни, предметов, <...>. Надо



бы проследить, есть ли у него «восклицательные знаки» и «многоточия» - симптомы души в рукописании и печати. Очень бы любопытно. Но в литературе я знаю, что он все «плел слова», <...> - но нигде «укуса», «рванул», - жизни.

<...>. У него везде звон, фразы, шелкание фраз, силлогизмы. Точно не течет речь (=кровь), а речь - составлена из слов. «Слова» же он знал, как ученый человек, прошедший и университет, и Дух. Академию. Соловьев усвоил и запомнил множество слов, <...>. Но родного-то слова между ними ни одного не было, все были чужие...

И он все писал и писал...

И делался все несчастнее и несчастнее...<sup>158</sup>

Rozanov describes Solov'ev's language as that of an Antichrist or false prophet:

<...> в Соловьева попал <...> какой-то осколочек настоящего «Противника Христа» <...>. Он <...> был человек, которому с людьми не о чем было поговорить, который «говорил только с Богом». Тут он невольно пошатнулся, т. е. натура пошатнула его в сторону «самосознания в себе пророка», которое не было ни деланным, ни притворным. «С людьми мне не о чем говорить», а с Богом - «говорится», «речь льется». <...> В нем <...> был именно ложный пророк <...>, в основе, - ложный Мессия (суть Антихриста) <...>.

[Lit. izg.: 142-44, n. 2]

Rozanov was also attacked by Solov'ev as a demonic and

Antichrist figure.<sup>159</sup> Yet despite this mutual 'demonizing', both men recognized in the other elements of prophetism, even if this was, as Rozanov claimed of Solov'ev, a false prophecy. A letter of 1895 from Solov'ev to Rozanov appears to hint at some sort of mystic conspiracy:

Не только я верю, что мы братья по духу, но и нахожу оправдание этой вере в словах Вашей надписи относительно signum Царствия Божия. Кто одинаково знает по опыту и одинаково понимает и оценивает эти знаки, залогов или предвещения Царства Божия те, конечно, братья по духу, и ничто не может разделить их.<sup>160</sup>

Losev writes that Rozanov also affirmed a prophetic kinship with Solov'ev to his nephew, S. M. Solov'ev, shortly after Solov'ev's death: 'Зачем мы ссорились с Владимиром Соловьевым? Ведь мы оба были пророки.'<sup>161</sup>

It is clear that both men recognized and reacted to features in each other which they felt to be particularly crucial at the time. Losev argues that Solov'ev realized the importance of Rozanov and so had to engage with him: 'он прекрасно понимал, что розановщина стала уже мощным духом современности, заслуживающим самого серьезного внимания'.<sup>162</sup> It would not be absurd to see their mutual engagement and antagonisms as motivated by a suspicion of similar strengths. They showed a combination of similar and fundamentally opposed inclinations which must have both repelled and drawn them repeatedly towards each other.

Rozanov's statements about Solov'ev's prophetic nature, 'с Богом - «говорится», «речь льется»', are reminiscent of his own writerly self-definition in Uedinennoe and Opavshie list'ia. As Rozanov recognized, they both show a constant journalistic instinct in spite of their grander, more spiritual aspirations. They are both 'many-legged', not so other-worldly as to be unaware of journalistic advantage. Both men set themselves up to be, in some degree, modern-day prophets. Solov'ev's portrayal of Rozanov as an Antichrist was founded on the same faults that Rozanov accuses him of, an immense egotism and the desire to put his own words before God's.

Yet the most exhaustive scholars of the two men's lives, Viktor Sukach and Losev, both emphasize that the acuity of their literary polemics was in contrast to the friendly tone of their private correspondence. Losev notes that such an 'extraordinarily good-natured' attitude to a critic who was hostile to him is 'the rarest exception' in Solov'ev's correspondence.<sup>163</sup> For the polemic between the two was extremely heated and even abusive.

As with his evaluation of Leont'ev, religion, and in particular the way in which a religious attitude showed itself in a person's life, was the crucial touchstone in Rozanov's attempt to understand Solov'ev's essential nature. Shortly after Solov'ev's death, Rozanov claimed that he was 'genuinely religious', and praised his contributions to original Russian religious thought: 'он прошелся «ледоколом» по нашему религиозному формализму

именно от того, что в нем уже загорелся энтузиазм к подлинным религиозным темам , к самому «существо» религии, а не «мнениям» около нея'.<sup>164</sup> However, even this area of reforming activity was described by Rozanov as 'publicism', and only four years later, on the first publication of Solov'ev's letters, he contradicted these views, arguing that Solov'ev was not instinctively religious. He cites the mocking tone with which Solov'ev describes the monks at Sergiev Posad in a letter to Strakhov, and claims that Solov'ev's interest in theological questions was more of an intellectual exercise than a matter of faith.<sup>165</sup> Not unlike Leont'ev, Rozanov sees Solov'ev as lacking an inner instinctive approach to religion, and being able to understand religion only through other intellectual activity; for Leont'ev this approach was aesthetic, for Solov'ev it was systematic. He believed that both men could understand only the forms of religion and lacked a sense of instinctive religious joy, without which their knowledge was nothing. Solov'ev created the last theological system in Europe, but as a system it was based on a logical approach to faith, which for Rozanov was a denial of faith.

Rozanov claimed that Solov'ev was too preoccupied with himself to understand the most simple things of religion. He compares his self-immersion to Tolstoi: 'он смотрит только на себя, кроме себя он ничего не видит, - и оттого не понимает элементарнейших вещей в религии'. [Lit. izq.: 350, n.1] Thus he completely ignored what was for Rozanov the most essential of essentials in religion, marriage and

the family. In a letter to Gor'kii, Rozanov insists that Solov'ev's indifference to the 'flesh and blood' questions of Rozanov's own life was the real cause of their disputes:

Я когда об этом Влад. Соловьеву (т. е. что дочери будут, верно по полной необеспеченности, проститутками) написал, - то он перешел к «другим философским темам», просто не интересуясь кровью и жизнью, и я тотчас, не за себя, а как бы за мир - почувствовал к нему презрение, и это было настоящей причиной, что мы вторично «сатирически» разошлись.<sup>166</sup>

In the second book of Opavshie list'ia, he attacks Solov'ev together with Florenskii, Tsvetkov and Bulgakov for their evasion of, or indifference to, the crucial questions of marriage, divorce and the family in all their writings on religion:

Вл. Соловьев написал «Смысл любви», но ведь «смысл любви» - это естественная философская тема: но и он ни одной строчки в десяти томах «Сочин.» не посвятил разводу, девственности вступающих в брак, измене и вообще терням и муке семьи. Ни одной строчкой ей не помог.'

[O. 1. II: 514]

Rozanov quotes Solov'ev as calling the sexual instinct the 'base instinct'.<sup>167</sup> In his afterword to the publication of Leont'ev's letters he emphasizes the aversion on the part

of both Solov'ev and Leont'ev to the flesh, and fleshly love. He compares their revulsion from the contemporary world to the self-castrating sects at a time of imminent apocalypse.<sup>168</sup> Rozanov believed that they were wrong. Freedom from despair was not to be found in a renunciation of the flesh but in its joyful understanding and respect:

Соловьев, также как и Леонтьев, как и заморивший себя постом Гоголь, не усматривали положительного, светлого и праведного содержимого в том, на что посягновение совершил уже Ориген. Между тем «мистицизм», коего жаждал Леонтьев, да и все они три, мог двинуться и не по пути скопчества, но по противоположному пути, - к окончанию того «ледникового периода», с которым мы сравнили весь круг скопческих идей.<sup>169</sup>

The new 'ice-age' of planetary 'dessication' and despair is evident for Rozanov not only in a fear of the flesh but also in the attempt to fix words in scholastic system in the belief that in control and submission there is an end to fear. Rozanov sees their ascetic existence as not a truly felt religious attitude, but a reaction of horror at the emptiness and intellectual poverty of contemporary life. Solov'ev sought refuge in logical, and Leont'ev in aesthetic, order. Rozanov sees both Solov'ev and Leont'ev as themselves implicated in the stagnating and dessicating influences in society that they sought to escape.

Solov'ev and Leont'ev, as was fitting to their

sectarian sympathies, were both theorists of the Apocalypse. Rozanov remarked on the similar tone of sadness and hopelessness in both men's writings on the end of history:

Слова: «Гоги и магоги», «finis mundi» и т. д., очень напоминают известное чтение Вл. Соловьева О конце всемирной истории и Антихристе. Главное - тоном напоминают, грустью, безнадежностью. <...> Близкие друзья, они, конечно, не раз говорили «о будущем», по свойственной русской привычке; о приоритете мысли, чувства тут не может быть и речи, да он вообще и не интересен, кроме как для библиографов-гробовщиков. Леонтьев на 10 лет раньше сказал ту мысль, которая зашумела из уст Соловьева (опять *fatum*).<sup>170</sup>

Повесть Вл. Соловьева о «монгольском завоевании Европы» перед Антихристом, пожалуй, параллельна, и, пожалуй, имитирует политические зовы Л-ва. То и другое знаменует вообще великую тоску по идеалу. По идеальном существовании, по идеальном лице.

[O. 1. I: 319]

An attraction towards a more contemplative, even mystical mood was an expression of the Apocalyptic anticipation of both men. Yet although Solov'ev lived to experience the resurgence of mysticism in society, Rozanov claims that he failed to make contact with the new generation despite a ready interest on their part: 'В этом втором поколении было

заметно менее желания действовать, а Соловьев не умел жить и не действовать. Как-то он мне сказал о себе, что он - «не психолог». Он сказал это другими словами, но заметно, что он жалел у себя о недостатке этой черты.<sup>171</sup>

Yet Rozanov emphasized the contemplative mystic mood of Solov'ev's poetry. He believed that the poetry expressed his 'true' nature, and saw it as very much in the spirit of the contemporary decadent writing and speculation. This, combined with his apocalyptic expectation, makes Solov'ev as expressive of the 1890s as of the 1860s that formed him: 'Настоящее Соловьева было его сумрачная, осенняя поэзия, затем некоторые суеверия первобытного склада, почти по типу ведовства и колдовства («черти» и т. п.), и затем его странное и страшное упорное предчувствие близости конца мира и пришествия Антихриста.'<sup>172</sup> Other 'decadents' were similarly drawn to these aspects of Solov'ev's writing. As Belyi confessed to Florenskii: 'Стоят «душные, знойные дни», и опять, и опять хватаюсь за Владимира Соловьева и весь бываю объят чувством конца <...>. Часто я внутренне бунтую против соловьевства и потом снова и снова проникаюсь его духом.'<sup>173</sup>

Most importantly for Rozanov, it was only in his poetry that Solov'ev revealed his true self:

Только стихи хороши...

Стихи были хороши, где он плакал о себе, о своей бедной погибшей душе.<sup>174</sup>



<...> только в стихах Соловьев и выразил свое личное и особенное, свое оригинальное и новое. Только здесь живет его «я», тогда в 8-ми томах прозы живут его способности и ученость, острый ум диалектика и изумительная эрудиция, работающая над чужими темами <...>.<sup>175</sup>

In his conclusion to the publication of Leont'ev's letters, Rozanov quotes Solov'ev's poem 'Belye kolokol'chiki' as evidence of the anticipation of new life, contrasting with the rest of his writing: 'Стихотворение это глубоко-ново, а мысль его, и содержание, и надежда - сотворены. Это что-то сотворенное душою Соловьева'.<sup>176</sup> Rozanov believed that the grief and longing which occasionally found expression in Solov'ev's poetry, but never in his prose, outweighed all the lugubrious wit of his journalism, by which he sought to conceal it. Characteristically, the most precious quality is the one that is kept silent: 'Загадочна и глубока его тоска; то, о чем он молчал. А слова, написанное - все самая обыкновенная журналистика <...>. ' [Ued.: 111]

## CHAPTER VI: ROZANOV AND DECADENCE

### THE 1890s AND THE BEGINNINGS OF DECADENCE

Rozanov was quick to respond to elements of the new 'poetic and psychological' mood of the 1890s in the outcasts from the 1860s and 1870s. In Literaturnye izgnanniki he emphasized the rarity of Govorukha-Otrok's attention to the individual litso, against the political mood of the time: 'человек, его лицо, его сердце, и никогда «человечество» 60-х годов - его занимало. И в этом он представляет собою заметное и ценное звено перехода тех лет в нечто новое и противоположное.' [Lit. izg.: 463] This historical transition is of great interest to Rozanov, as he himself experienced the conflict between the optimism of the 1860s, and the new contemplative psychologism of the 1890s. Rozanov argued that it was a specific atmosphere in society that so stifled the work of these writers. In his articles, and his footnotes to Literaturnye izgnanniki, Rozanov indicates distinct changes in mood in Russian society across the decades from the 1860s to the 1890s. His analysis of these changes suggests the influence of Grigor'ev's concept of an atmosphere (veianie) of an era. Rozanov's description of the transitional points of Russian history often comes close to the depiction of an individual's spiritual or psychological state. At times it has such force of personal belief that one could equally well be tracing the movements of Rozanov's own mental

climate. This projection of one's own mood on to the world was, however, a common method for Rozanov: 'Скучно о себе, а как мы начинаем мерять мир «от себя» - то и о мире скучно.'<sup>1</sup>

Rozanov describes three crucial phases in recent Russian history: the optimistic positivist spirit of the 1860s, the transitional phase of disillusioned atheism in the 1870s and 1880s, and the new mystical, psychological, and religious rebirth of the 1890s and beginning of the new century. Rozanov describes the central phase of unbelief in footnotes to Literaturnye izgnanniki:

В конце концов, почти со слезами скажем, что в 70-ые, 80-ые годы русские пережили страшную трагедию души, трагедию именно мирового холода, <...> - и никто никого не любил, страдал от этого и все-таки не любил.

[Lit. izg.: 252]

Rozanov cites as proof the 'terrible observation' of Strakhov, who had intimate conversations with Dostoevskii, that Dostoevskii was unable to believe in God, and was tormented by this.

<...> в 80-х годах минувшего столетия Россия и общество русское пережило столь разительно-глубокий атеизм, что люди даже типа Достоевского, Рачинского и (извините) Розанова предполагали друг у друга атеизм, но скрывае~~мый~~мый: до того казалось невозможным «верить», «не статочным» - верить!!

Как, что переменялось, переменялось со страшной незаметностью, но - «Гость пришел в Ночи и тихо, - и сел»; и мы «очень просто верим», и я знаю, что у меня «за стеною - Гость, друг, реальный как мои дети». «Мы все верим, очень просто». Почему? как? Когда начали верить? Неведомо, неизследимо. Я сам (в обществе, в истории) пережил день за днем эту главу ея, и сам не знаю «когда все случилось».

[Lit. izg.: 251-52, n.2]

Dostoevskii did not live to see the quiet return of faith in the 1890s that Rozanov describes. However, Rozanov believes that it is anticipated in his work. He describes Dostoevskii's images of Zosima's love for all humanity as the desperate attempt of a man, freezing in the snow, to create some warmth by blowing into his numb fists and stamping his feet on the ground, motivated not by the warmth of conviction but by the unbearableness of the cold.<sup>2</sup> Rozanov believes that Strakhov, Leont'ev and even Solov'ev all suffered the effects of this 'tragedy' of a spiritual 'ice-age'.<sup>3</sup> He argues that this is because the lack of receptive warmth around them, in society and in their readers, prevented the seeds of life in their thought from germinating, and contributed to their isolation.

The new mood of the 1890s was characterized by a new attention to metaphysical aspects of philosophy, and a resurgence of interest in religious questions. It was a reaction against an exclusively rational and materialist approach to reality. The transition was marked by the

founding of journals such as Grot's Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii in 1889. Rozanov saw the overwhelming characteristic of this new phase as a deepening of the instinctive and non-rational, mystical inclinations in man. The battle against rationalism in the writings of Strakhov and fellow 'literary exiles' at last found a resonance and receptive audience in the new intellectual atmosphere and developed into a more complex exploration of man's mind, his instinctive and subconscious motivations.

Rozanov called the new attention to the non-rational aspects of man's thought and behaviour 'psychologism' ('psikhologichnost''). He saw himself as foremost amongst the writers who had provoked this change, together with the younger generation of 'literary exiles', Rtsy, Shperk and Florenskii, and argued that their activity represented a decisive move away from the radical anti-individualistic approach to literature: 'Редко-редко у меня мелькает мысль, что напором своей психологичности я одолею литературу. Т. е. что «потом» будут психологичны, - как я и «наши» (Рцы, Фл., Шперк, еще несколько, немного).' [Q. 1. II: 545-46]

Rozanov argued that the changes in ways of thinking in society were demonstrated by new words that had become current in speech and articles. He emphasizes words such as 'psikhopat', 'psikhologichnost'' and 'chutkost'', that were indicative of this change in mentality:

В мое время, при моей жизни, создались некоторые новые слова: в 1880-м году я сам себя называл «психопатом», смеясь

и веселясь новому удачному слову. До себя я ни от кого (кажется) его не слыхал. Потом (время Шопенгауэра) многие стали называть себя или других; потом появилось это в журналах. Теперь это бранная кличка, но первоначально это обозначило «болезнь духа», вроде Байрона <...>. Потом позднее возникло слово «декадент», и тоже я был из первых. Шперк с гордостью говорил о себе: «Я, батенька, декадент». Это было раньше, чем мы оба услышали о Брюсове; А. Белый - не рождался. Теперь распространилось слово «чуткий»: нужно бы посмотреть книгу «О понимании»; но в идеях «чуткости» и «настроения», с ярким сознанием их и признанием их важности, я писал эту книгу.

Все эти слова, новые в обществе и в литературе, выражали - ступенями - огромное углубление человека. Все стали немножко «метерлинками», и в этом суть. Но стали «метерлинками» раньше, чем слышали о Метерлинке.

[Ued.: 68]

Rozanov identified characteristics that he had looked for in the neglected conservative writers and thinkers of the previous generation amongst this new generation of thinkers. His characterization of both movements reveals the consistency of his own concerns. Govorukha-Otrok demonstrated, Rozanov believed, the psychological transition from Strakhov's approach, which had been marked by faith in intellectual rigour. As Rozanov argues, the questioning of such faith can lead to greater freedom and

intimacy of tone, and of the very objects of enquiry. In Literaturnye izgnanniki, Rozanov told his readers to pay attention to the change in tone when reading the letters of Govorukha-Otrok after those of Strakhov. Characteristically, he uses the term 'chutkii':

Чуткий, внимательный слух разслышит в этих строках письма душу совсем иного тона, нежели у Н. Н. Страхова <...>. Страхов был чист особенною институтскою чистотою (женские институты): но нельзя скрыть, что иногда хочется <...> спуститься в подвальный этаж, в кухню, и там покопаться около кушаний, сковородок, пирогов и проч., и что иногда в «прислуге на кухне» найдешь и услышишь тон речи более народный и более созвучный сердцу, чем у классных наставниц, учителей и у директрисы. Так и Говорука: с ним легче, естественнее льется речь, он больше «наш», чем великолепный и ученый Страхов, хотя он и не так солиден и надежен.

[Lit. izg.: 443, n.1]

The writer, and his readers are drawn to 'go underground'. These were the scenes, and tones of debate, anticipated by Dostoevskii, the writer whom Rozanov had described as being left out in the cold, even from his own dreams, by his contemporary context. Dostoevskii's writing was a vital impetus to the new intellectual atmosphere of the 1890s. Dostoevskii's psychological and religious depths were the focus of concentrated attention for the first time. Rozanov

had himself helped to initiate this rediscovery with his essay, Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore, and his critical introduction to the 1894 'Niva' edition of Dostoevskii's collected works.<sup>4</sup> Rozanov wrote that Dostoevskii had anticipated the new 'tone' of debate, which he saw as the tone of the kitchens and cellars, the images that he uses to describe the tonal transition from Strakhov to Govorukha-Otrok in the passage above.<sup>5</sup> 'Cellars' and 'underground' imply a new sort of questioning, this was the exploration of these very 'cellars' and 'undergrounds' in the human mind. Rozanov claimed that much of this questioning was ignored at the time when Dostoevskii was writing. In the article 'Oдна из zamechatel'nykh idei F. M. Dostoevskogo', Rozanov discusses the rediscovery of Zapiski iz podpol'ia as a vital work underlying the entire new 'decadent' mood and questioning in society. He interprets an article by Mikhailovskii, attacking the book, as a last attempt of an out-dated rationalist way of thinking to defend itself from Dostoevskii's inevitable destruction of its theories: 'Михайловский уперся в старый строй, в извечный строй, чтобы как-нибудь защититься от гениальной критики Достоевского.'<sup>6</sup> From the turn of the century, the 'underground' ('podpol'e') took its place alongside terms like 'psychologism' and 'psychopath' in the new intellectual vocabulary that Rozanov described in Uedinennoe:

Целый ряд писателей выдающегося успеха, - Л. Шестов,



Мережковский, Философов, - начали постоянно ссылаться на «подпольного человека», «подпольную философию», «подпольную критику»... И термин «подполье», понятие «подполья», наконец, сделались таким же «беглым огнем» в литературе, журналистике и прессе, как когда-то «лишний человек» Тургенева, его «отцы и дети», или как «нравственное совершенствование» после Толстого.<sup>7</sup>

'Decadence' was also a term in the new vocabulary. In Uedinennoe, Rozanov claimed that he was among the first to use it. He writes that Shperk was calling himself a decadent before Belyi was born.<sup>8</sup> Yet Rozanov also used the term to attack other writers and distance himself from contemporary trends. Unlike the other new 'psychological' vocabulary, 'decadence' was a heterogeneous and shifting, although the most general term for the many new movements in writing, philosophy and other arts. A foreign word, originally with negative connotations, it was alternatively paraded and rejected by different groups and individuals at various stages of their activity. Rozanov was no exception. Despite showing such an excited awareness of the new mood and language of the 1890s, Rozanov's reaction to the supposed representatives of this change was initially ambiguous. His first article about the decadents, published under various titles,<sup>9</sup> shows an alienation from the aesthetic manifestations of this movement. This hesitancy is also evident in a letter to Pertsov of 1897 about a possible meeting with the critic Volynskii: 'Шперк говорил

- хороший, простой человек, я же всех символистов представлял какими-то онанистами-гадами.'<sup>10</sup>

However, Rozanov could not but recognize the impact of this movement and soon realized its possibilities. Many of the new generation of slavophiles, or 'literary exiles' such as Florenskii, Ern and Bulgakov, became associated with the movement, and so began to play a more active role in Russian culture. The movement brought forth new talents like Andrei Belyi, whom Rozanov pronounced on first encounter a genius.<sup>11</sup> The overlaps between the new slavophiles, religious thinkers, and literary decadents were extensive, as was shown by the attendance at the Petersburg Religious and Philosophical Society, and at the increasing numbers of literary gatherings: the Merezhkovskiis' 'salon', Ivanov's 'tower' on Wednesdays, Rozanov's Sundays.<sup>12</sup> Viktor Sukach claims that decadence offered Rozanov an escape from the dead end that conservatism had become by the end of the century.<sup>13</sup>

In a letter to Pertsov, Rozanov explained the change in his attitude towards the new movement by his realization that decadence could give a new impetus to the fight against the stagnancy of liberalism and rationalism, in a way that could never have been achieved by the conservatives:

Да, батюшка, я стал любить декадентов; они своими «фиолетовыми руками» сделали то, чего не мог сделать Катков своими громами, Страхов своей рассудительностью,

образованностью и тихой борьбой. <...> Все сумеречное и неясное нам нравится <...>. Собственно я был яростным консерватором не по любви к консерватизму, но по ненависти к либерализму <...> и его «средненькому», «сладенькому с кислотой», против этой отвратительной культурно-политической маниловщины <...>. Но видя, что «фиолетовые» руки восторжествовали и либерализм сам «спасается куда можно» - я становлюсь внутренне свободным. Да, больше сумрака, больше неясности! больше поэтического, больше святого! К черту политика и да здравствует арфа <...>.<sup>14</sup>

The decadent movement appealed to Rozanov as representing a literary mood dissatisfied with the limitations of rational enquiry and interested in the meeting point of knowledge with what is unknowable: the area that is described as 'twilight' and 'unclear'. He recognized that the movement offered a new broad field for enquiry and exploration in print, while he in turn became an inspiration to the decadents. This was the beginning of an era which, in 1913, he hailed as offering the sort of speculative and mystically-inclined readers who would have provided warmth and encouragement for Solov'ev, Leont'ev and even Strakhov.

Rozanov was an active contributor to the journal Mir iskusstva from the start. His friendship with the Merezhkovskiis led to his participation in the founding of the Religious and Philosophical Society and of the journal Novyi put' in 1902. Rozanov was at the centre of the new

intellectual activity: his ideas were frequently the main themes and sources of inspiration for the decadents, in his articles for the new journals, at the various decadent evenings, and as topics of debate at the meetings of the Religious and Philosophical Society. Yet Rozanov resisted typification, remaining at a distance from the decadents. As Zinaida Gippius recognized, Rozanov could not be defined by any literary grouping or alignment: 'Кажется, с 1900 года, если не раньше, Розанов сближается с литературно-эстетической средой в Петербурге. Примкнул к этой струе? Отнюдь нет. Он внутренне «несклоняемый».'<sup>15</sup>

In his articles for Mir iskusstva and Novyi put' Rozanov could branch out from his themes of the Church, ecclesiastical dogma and sectarianism to more esoteric articles on Judaism and Ancient Egypt, as well as writing on contemporary events. He soon found his unique role amongst the new aesthetic avant-garde. Gippius describes his excitement at the founding of Novyi put': 'О Розанове что и говорить. Он был несказанно рад журналу. Прежде всего - упросил, чтобы ему дали постоянное место «на что захочет», и чтоб названо оно было «В своем углу».'<sup>16</sup> The new journals gave Rozanov an unparalleled new freedom and outlet for the full range of his interests. His articles of this period explore far more directly man's religious needs and their historical forms of expression in a free and eclectic way, despite the 'triple censorship' that Gippius described in Zhivye litsa, her memoir of the period. This was the official censors of the state and Church, and the

unofficial censorship of the intelligentsia, of whom, she writes, Rozanov was blithely unaware, as he was of the need to be 'politic', for tact and timing.<sup>17</sup> Rozanov soon gained a reputation as the initiator of much of the new debate on the relation between God, religion and the world. Blok observed the power of these new enthusiasms over his friend Evgenii Ivanov, in a letter to Sergei Solov'ev in 1904: 'Он вполне и безраздельно пылает Розановым и Мережковским.'<sup>18</sup>

These new opportunities for discussion were stimulating for Rozanov, and for the first time his daring and idiosyncrasy was enthusiastically encouraged. In a footnote of 1913 to Literaturnye izgnanniki he implies that his articles had at last found a sympathetic readership in this generation, who did not experience the obstacles to understanding that Strakhov, Pobedonostsev and others had complained of:

«Непонятность Розанова» есть одна из изумительных «для Розанова» сторон. <...> Тут есть какая-то идиосинкразия меня: между тем как все, Нувель, Дягилев, Философов, Перцов - понимали меня в каждом слове, понимали меня в оттенках, в недосказанном (статьи в «Мире искусства» и в «Н. Пути»). Так-же понимают как я сам себя - даже студенты университета и духовной академии. Почему это? Что? - Ignotum... Может быть дух разных генераций? Уже «не то поколение»?..

[Lit. izg.: 246-47, n.2]

This sort of empathetic understanding was what Rozanov

believed had been so fatally lacking in the previous generation of readers. Rozanov writes of the representatives of the new decadent movement as the inheritors of the traditions of thought that marked out the group of 'literary exiles' in their isolation. Thus he emphasizes their understanding of the 'unspoken' thought and shades of meaning. In describing both groups of writers he emphasizes the persistence of forms of non-verbal communication surrounding the literal meaning of what is said, the importance of intonation, resonance and gesture. Rozanov was stimulated by this enthusiastic new readership, the readers who 'understand me as I do myself', who would read with an instinctive subjective identification. He sought readers who understood the movements of his self-contradiction in the exploration of his ideas. In a letter to Pertsov of 1918, Rozanov declared himself a decadent, describing the process of understanding beyond words that united him with Pertsov and Florenskii, just as it had united the generation of 'literary exiles':

И вот, входит ко мне П. П. П. «и прочие» - и я (сам декадент, конечно) - узнаю «родные души», узнаю - безгласно, без говора, без доказательства, и хотя мы с «Дм <итрием> Серг <еевичем>» - рассорились, но в сущности-то ведь мы - одно и то же. Флор <енский>, конечно, тоже декадент и слишком декадент.<sup>19</sup>

In the above letter Rozanov explicitly connects this

form of internal understanding with Judaic religious traditions. The religious sense of the Jews was marked by an emotive understanding was more powerful than words: 'Их глубокая тайна лежит в особом говоре сердца, «от души к душе», без посредства, почти без звуков, без слов'.<sup>20</sup> Here Rozanov uses the same phrases with which he characterized his own writing, and identified the spirit in which it should be understood. He believed that it was this Judaic force of achieving an internal communication of the soul 'almost without words', that makes all other books apart from the Bible redundant. Thus the decadents, like the 'literary exiles', are characterized in so far as they answer to Rozanov's ideals of verbal and literary activity, whose sources were ancient and sacred. His writing on both movements shows the consistency of his own interests, although this could lead to a wilful identification of characteristics in writers that conformed to Rozanov's ideal, but were more eloquent of this ideal than of the writers themselves.

Despite his late assertions of decadence, Rozanov never completely identified himself with the writers whom he heralded as so liberating an influence. The decadents were valuable as a point of contact through which he might explore ideas of interest. He observed them as a phenomenon which represented alternatively attractive and repellent aspects of literary engagement. As Gippius noted, Rozanov was drawn to the meetings and houses of the decadents, to the Merezhkovskiis and to Remizov in particular, but came

always alone, keeping his visits secret from his wife.<sup>21</sup> There is a sense that these houses marked out an area of illicit excitement and free play for Rozanov, in contrast to the sacred home, which Rozanov had made his shrine of all eternal values, yet which would have been threatened if it had not been clearly marked off from these places of free exploration. Artistically, Rozanov remained at a distance from the new writers. He had little sympathy for decadent and symbolist poetry. Gollerbakh describes Rozanov's avowed incomprehension of Briusov and other 'young' poets.<sup>22</sup> Yet he acutely ridiculed the more lurid extremes of erotic mysticism in his few articles that deal with the modern poetry. His slightly ironic description of the decadents' 'violet arms' in the letter to Pertsov, quoted earlier, underlines his detachment. Most symbolist poetry he found fantastical and unrealistic.

Rozanov could afford to ignore the failings of the poetry for the sake of the new arena that decadence gave him in which to engage with the themes of human religious and sexual expression, to express himself freely in the style he chose, without being expected to produce a rational polemic or a consistent argument. Journalistic opportunities, such as his regular column for Novyi put', 'V svoem uglu', allowed Rozanov a familiarity of tone and address to the reader that he had increasingly sought. His intimate confidential tone stood out against other, more grandiose metaphysical speculation. His own spiritual speculations were almost always rooted in the precise



details of life and human behaviour. However, this difference soon became a crucial point of divergence. Rozanov found the decadents superficial and their writing insufficiently rooted in the realities he held sacred:

Перед ледяным «я» проносятся чисто абстрактные видения, не цепляющиеся ни за какую реальную действительность, ничего из реального мира не несущие в себе, <...>. Среди этих сцен, предметов, слов, захваченных зыбким воспоминанием из мира действительности и несущихся вперед без намерения и смысла, попадают как бы брошенные, как бы потерянные мысли, без развития, даже без сколько-нибудь необходимой связи.<sup>23</sup>

Rozanov emphasizes the absence of concrete and specific details in the writing of the decadents, which would have rooted these thoughts in time and place: 'Едва ли во всей этой словесности можно найти соответственное имя - имя города, название местности и часа.'<sup>24</sup> This contrasts with his own opavshie list'ia genre, which is marked by an almost superstitious naming of the time and place of Rozanov's thoughts.

Sukach claims that the 1905 revolution resulted in a new phase of conservatism for Rozanov.<sup>25</sup> Increasingly he appealed to the Russian people, their religious need, and rural traditions, which he sees as containing an essential reality. He contrasts this to the vanity of literary life in the city which he came increasingly to see as a

dangerous evasion of such reality, in which a chimera might conquer, at the expense of thousands of hidden and unexpressed existences. Rozanov's early reservations about the decadents are echoed in an outburst in Uedinennoe:

Безумие - моя прежняя жизнь; недаром «друг» так сопротивлялся сближению с декадентами. Пустые люди, без значения, не нужны России. «Слава литераторов да веет над нами». Пусть некоторые и талантливые, да это все равно. Все равно с точки зрения Костромы, Ельца, конкретного, жизненного. Мое дело было быть с Передольским, Титовым, Максимовым <...>; вот люди, вот русские. А «стишки» пройдут, даже раньше, чем истлеет бумага.

[Ued.: 128]

#### MEREZHKOVSKII, GIPPIUS AND ROZANOV

Dmitrii Merezhkovskii was seen by Rozanov as embodying the continuing weakness of the decadent movement, and as a particularly painful example of the emptiness that threatened contemporary life. Indeed, in Rozanov's descriptions, Merezhkovskii could be seen as the supreme embodiment of esoteric isolation from reality. His work is sterile and unproductive, because he lacks true connection to human life. As with Solov'ev, Rozanov claims that he is unable to produce work of value, despite the immensity of his literary output. Both men are pitiable figures, because the energy of their, as Rozanov believes, redundant intellectual activity shows a longing to take an active

part in life. In his Mimoletnoe of 1915, Rozanov describes them as lacking physical substance, which for him symbolized their inability to make words flesh: 'Да и вообще в Соловьеве, вот как и в Мережковском, есть какая-то странная (и страшная для меня) ирреальность. «Точно их нет», «точно они не родились». А ходят между нами привидения, под псевдонимом «Соловьев», «Мережковский».'<sup>26</sup> Both men shield their physical absence in a profusion of words that signify very little:

Я как-то упоминал раз (в афоризмах), что есть странные люди (таинственные), не оставляющие следа от себя, физического впечатления, как бы неосязаемые, бесплотные, а только «звонящие», «говорящие», спорящие и почти всегда талантливые. Люди «без запаха в себе» <...>.

Люди не тяжеловесные. Люди, ходящие по земле и не вдавливающие в землю свою ногу. Не «воняющие» и «не пахнущие».<sup>27</sup>

Rozanov usually sees sadness as an emotion whose nature is hot, that binds us to the world and to other living things, generating intimate words. However, Merezhkovskii's sadness has no heat: 'поразительно, что самая грусть его - холодная. Грусть вообще тепла по природе своей: но у Мер-ого она изменила своей природе.' [O. 1. I: 313]

Rozanov is particularly wary of Merezhkovskii's lack of Russianness, the lack of an instinctive sympathy for or familiarity with the aspects of Russian life that Rozanov

held most sacred:

Не только в Мережковском есть странная ирреальность, но и «мир его» как-то странно недействителен. Он вечно говорит о России и о Христе. Две темы. И странным образом ни Христа, ни России в его сочинениях нет.

Как будто он никогда не был в России...

И как будто он никогда не был крещен...

Удивительно. Удивительное явление. Я думаю, действительное «последнее несчастье».<sup>28</sup>

Merezhkovskii is described as an incarnation of the very unreality that Rozanov feared to be immanent to modernity and had at first hoped that the decadents might overcome. Instead he is exemplary of the very planetary coldness and dessication that is described in Rozanov's writing with increasing force from 1913. Rozanov argues that Merezhkovskii was compelled to write incessantly as though to try and overcome his lack of substance, yet he succeeds only in immortalizing his own emptiness:

О, как страшно ничего не любить, ничего не ненавидеть, все знать, много читать, постоянно читать, и наконец, к последнему несчастью, - вечно писать, т.е. вечно записывать свою пустоту и увековечивать то, что для всякого есть достаточное горе, если даже и сознается только в себе.

От этого Мережковский вечно грустен.<sup>29</sup>

Страшная для Мережковского сторона - его недействительность. Ирреальность.

И он все силится воплотиться и от этого все говорит.

Но слово пало на землю. Не как роса, а как сухая земля. <...>

Поразительно, что самые его БОЛЬШИЕ СЛОВА (у него их много) тоже не пристаут к человеку. Не всасываются. «Слышали» и «ничего». Это ужасно.<sup>30</sup>

Rozanov's reference to Merezhkovskii's 'big words' echoes a point made by Blok in an article on Merezhkovskii of 1909.<sup>31</sup> Blok described Merezhkovskii's use of immense letters to indicate God and Christ that dominated his entire writing. Rozanov quoted Blok's article in an article of the same year, concluding: 'Мережковский есть также религиозно-безвкусный человек, и, придя к этой мысли, начинаешь почти все разгадывать в нем. Да... Буквы огромные, слова всегда громкие: но кроме слов, букв, видности - и нет ничего.'<sup>32</sup> Both men were repelled by the loudness with which Merezhkovskii declaimed about things that are intimate and sacred.

Rozanov described Merezhkovskii's writing as a series of unfelt poses. Even his radicalism after the 1905 revolution is dismissed as political opportunism:

И он добровольно и сознательно стал «пошл», чтобы «пойти»...

И «пошел»...

<...> Теперь он видный либеральный писатель щедринской Руси, «обличающий» даже добродетель императоров.

[O. I. I: 312-13]

Rozanov's argument about Merezhkovskii's lack of content is echoed in the observations of various contemporaries that Merezhkovskii adopted much of his subject matter from Rozanov. The teacher Vladimir Gippius, a cousin of Zinaida Gippius, told Rozanov's daughter that Merezhkovskii's writing on Dostoevskii was significantly influenced by Rozanov's ideas: 'И потому так хороша и книга Мережковского «Толстой и Достоевский», что она проникнута духом книги вашего отца.'<sup>33</sup> Gor'kii also cites Rozanov as one of the writers whom Merezhkovskii plagiarizes in a letter of 1924: 'Писатель он не талантливый, образов у него нет, наблюдательности - тоже нет, знания его я всегда находил сомнительными. Своими идеями - не обладает, берет их у талантливой Гиппиус, у В. В. Розанова, у Шестова, брал у Ницше, у Достоевского. И всегда брал плохо.'<sup>34</sup> Similarly, Belyi maintained that Merezhkovskii adopted features of both Rozanov and himself: 'Разговор протекал в специальном жаргоне, которым владел, проштудировав Р-ва и раскрасив его моей палитрой схем, моих красочных уподоблений.'<sup>35</sup> Prishvin wrote in his diary that Merezhkovskii was 'in love' with Rozanov, even at the time of Rozanov's official ostracism from the Religious and Philosophical Society: 'Всем известно, что Мережковский влюблен в Розанова, и сам Розанов пишет в «Уединенном»: «за что он (Мережковский)

меня любит?»<sup>36</sup>

Yet Rozanov had compassion for Merezhkovskii as a somewhat pathetic and uncreative figure. There is no trace, however, of compassion in his attacks on Gippius, despite the similarities of argument in much of their critical work. The genuine parallels between the articles of Gippius and Rozanov, their underlying concern for the true development of individual identity (litso) and its interconnection with others in society, contrasts with the superficial thematic similarities of Rozanov and Merezhkovskii's writing, which are more usually linked together. Yet Rozanov was far more intolerant of the personality of Gippius, who was the cleverer and more independent thinker of the Merezhkovskii partnership.

In his Mimoletnoe of 1914, unpublished at the time, Rozanov characterizes Gippius as a 'sorceress'. Rozanov was repelled by Gippius's intellect which he called 'diabolic':

Слова и мысли все Мережковского, одного Мережковского. З-нка придавала ум и остроту. «Бабье-колдовское начало». Она вообще колдунья, об этом и Тернавцев говорил <...>.

<...>

Они вообще немножко не умные. «Умна» только злая З., бесовским и дьявольским умом, неподвижным, окаменелым, несколько гоголевским, без обретения и движения. З. вообще «неподвижна» <...>. Курит папиросы, надушенные духами (сильнейше надушенные, до тошноты). Но она вне «дьявольского узелька» тоже неумна.<sup>37</sup>

The vehemence of Rozanov's unpublished attacks on Gippius was perhaps motivated by the fact that he was uneasy with overly intellectual women, thus he seeks to depict Gippius's intellectual acumen as a supernatural and malevolent force in order to distance himself from it. Rozanov believed that women were most powerful when they expressed what he saw as essential 'feminine' qualities of gentleness, yielding receptivity, or passivity.<sup>38</sup>

Rozanov found the intellectually suppressed eroticism of the relationships between the Merezhkovskiis and Dmitrii Filosofov repellent. He makes free allusion to these relationships in the Mimoletnoe of 1914. Although Rozanov uses increasingly demonic overtones, suggestive of the mystical apocalyptic mood of pre-revolutionary St Petersburg, to describe the Merezhkovskii circle, he is dismissive of their own interest in the Apocalypse:

Мережковские сделали величайшие усилия и неотступно делали их года три, чтобы привлечь Фил[ософ]ва на свою сторону. Тут и «Зинины чары», мне всегда остававшиеся непонятными. И победили <...>.

<...> И решились преобразовать Рел[игиозно] - Фил[ософское] об[щест]во. «Будем смешивать революцию и Апокалипсис».<sup>39</sup>

Rozanov became increasingly distant from the Merezhkovskiis as they turned their organizing enthusiasms towards the social cause. He felt that their actions were



self-deceiving, and that the idea of their kinship with the Russian people was absurd. Gippius explained Rozanov's alienation from their cause as deriving from his own instinctive antipathy to 'social questions': 'Иногда Розанов, по гениальному наитию, мог изрекать вещи в этой области очень верные, даже пророческие. Но не понимал тут ровно ничего, органически не мог понимать, и отвращался.'<sup>40</sup>

Rozanov describes the earnestness of the Merezhkovskiis' activity as naive and childish: 'они какие-то дети (кудесники-дети), - в непонимании России, в разобщении со всяким «русским духом» и вместе (суть детей) со страшной серьезностью, почти трагичностью в своих «практических замыслах» (особенно «политика»)'.<sup>41</sup> Always acute to the evidence that was not expressed in words, Rozanov pays far less attention to the Merezhkovskiis' and Filosofov's written articles than to their physical style and details of their appearance. The incongruity of these fastidiously refined decadents courting the hungry worker produced a crude absurdity. They are remote from 'fleshly' realities, not merely those of physical love, but also from the reality of the bread and butter questions that they claimed to be adopting in their support of the workers' cause. The Merezhkovskiis and their followers had become too much like the radicals, for whom the social cause became an empty slogan. Thus in the Mimoletnoe of 1914, Rozanov writes a scathing attack on the hypocrisy of the Merezhkovskiis. He attacked them for proclaiming 'social responsibility' while receiving private incomes from their

parents' state pensions and maintaining the instinctive refinements of their aristocratic background. The attack was also a reaction to the Merezhkovskiis' distancing from Rozanov. He believed that they had broken with him because his wayward self-expression and reputation as a reactionary was an embarrassment to their new-sought social-democratic image:

...да я не против общественности говорю, а против худой общественности...

Против празднословия в ней, против фальши в ней.

«Общественным деятелем» Философов выразил бы себя <...> если бы отказался от пенсии по службе отца <...>, действительного тайного советника.

Но он этого не делает.

А слова его? Кому они нужны.

Слова нужны - Пушкина. Вот за них можно платить и ренты, и пенсии. А наши слова так обыкновенны.

И что же толчется со своими словами Рел [игиозно] -фил [ософское] общество. <...> Так ведь это праздноглаголение. <...>

Что такое «слова» около «работы»? Слова во всяком случае среднего значения, и не более.

То же что песенка, которую мурлыкает портной. <...> Но и тут: пусть и поет портной. А не то чтобы по-иному на ухо чирикала Зинаида Николаевна. Это, право же, даже не освежает. <...>

Декаденты. В трудовом вопросе они остались

декадентами. <...>

Но ей-ей, я тоже не понимаю этой революции в щиблетах.  
И с папиросками, которые надушены о-де-колоном.<sup>42</sup>

Rozanov's claim that the social element was alien to him does not mean a contempt for human connection and duty. He believed that the slogans of social improvement belied the real state of relations between people. He claimed that love was foremost a tie of blood. Rozanov was distrustful of social 'brotherhood' or even love of one's neighbour, counselling people instead to direct their love to their family and home above all, and remain true in this.

Rozanov's written comments on the Merezhkovskiis in his Mimoletnoe of 1914, which he did not seek to publish, perhaps give a distorted picture, particularly of Gippius. He himself admitted that he had received immense kindness and goodwill from them. The distortions are perhaps increased by the fact that Rozanov presents them in these writings as a phenomenon of Russian culture, they become, to a certain extent, symbols of his anxiety about the fate of Russian culture as a whole. Perceptive insights become exaggerated into caricature in Rozanov's imagination, taking on an hysterical and fantastical tone. Thus the Merezhkovskiis are transformed into demonic, bloodless, half-children, half-sorcerers, conjuring an apocalypse in a haze of perfumed cigarette smoke. Rozanov actually spent a great deal of time in their company until the 1905 revolution. It was only later, maybe, that he transformed

them in his imagination. Perhaps the best refutation of the extremes of Rozanov's attacks are Gippius's own reminiscences of Rozanov, published in Zhivye litsa. These give a very lucid and fair appreciation of Rozanov, much of it in his own words, with none of the grotesqueness with which Rozanov is carried away in his descriptions. Like much of her critical writing, they demonstrate a calm and independent intellect, remote from the charges of demonism.

The Merezhkovskii entourage was not the only target of Rozanov's increasing trepidation about the decadents. In his books and articles that followed the 1905 revolution he began to attack the movement as a whole, as an insignificant and ephemeral literary phenomenon. In the article 'Kritik russkogo *décadenc'a*', he distances himself entirely from the movement and its journals as though he had never taken an active part in them. He compares the insignificance of the decadent publications with the power of the established press:

<...> что такое тоненькие «Весы» с их полутысячею подписчиков около этих классических столпов печати. Очень мало, почти ничего. <...> декадентство - уголок русской литературы, бьющийся за существование <...>. Но и только. Это - именно уголок, но не русская литература. Декадентство отнюдь ее не обоняло, не победило в ней.<sup>43</sup>

Rozanov had hoped that the new direction of writing implied new depths of spiritual perception and would lead

to a reassertion of a truly Russian religious tradition, and religious originality. However, by 1909, Rozanov is pessimistic, even about the effects of the new psychologism, seeing the implicit understanding beyond words that he had always sought no longer as a force for renewal but as a symptom of approaching old age:

Я заметил выше о странно поражающей психологичности всех декадентов, каких встречал: они понимают все оттенки чужих настроений с полуслова, с одного взгляда, как будто уже в утробе матери они пережили всякие настроения и родились прямо зрелыми, опытными. <...> Это зрелость, это - старость. Но старость и не творит. В декадентстве решительно нет творчества, и это их хоронит, как литературное течение.<sup>44</sup>

Rozanov's disenchantment with the decadents was accompanied by a new nostalgia for the youth, energy, and naive optimism of the 1860s. The spirit of the 1860s, which he claimed as his first intellectual enthusiasm, had left a persistent mark on Rozanov. In articles such as 'Homines novi...',<sup>45</sup> young revolutionaries, the inheritors of the men of the 1860s, are described as innocent, like people before the Fall.<sup>46</sup> The young marxist idealists become, like the Ancient Egyptians or Jews, a symbol of untroubled and free existence, before the Fall of scholasticism and literariness, the increasing isolation of people, and the freezing and dessicating effects of knowledge. Rozanov

admires their purity and naive conviction in contrast to the jaded sophistication of the decadents. They reawaken Rozanov's hopes for a resurrection of the Tree of Life. Rozanov associated this new life with joy and strength, he saw pessimism as a symptom of the ageing of the planet, accelerated by over-reliance on literary authority.

A letter to Pertsov of 1900 anticipated Rozanov's later reaction against the decadents; in it he complained of their 'gloominess', and celebrated the 18th century as the most optimistic, rational and materialist age:

Хорошо сегодня о XVIII в. и Пушкине. <...>. Самый веселый и рацион<альный> и матерьял<ьный> [век]. А ведь в веселости, батенька, есть свой смысл; в fin de siècle и декад<ентах> и у Вас мне не нравится «нос на квинту повесили». Так жить нельзя, с этим далеко не уйдешь, ноги не уносятся. Некоторое умеренное и постоянное веселье души, кажется, угодно Богу.<sup>47</sup>

In 1914 Rozanov describes the activity of the decadents as the mere sprinkling of perfume on the immense load that represents the work of the 1860s:

Затем 90-ые годы, приход декадентов и мистиков... Они побрызгали духами из пипсетки на огромный воз, со скрипом на всю степь, с мычанием буйволов на всю степь, - и воз, конечно, не остановился, а духи высохли. И теперь, и до сих пор, в сущности, тон всей литературы есть тон 60-х годов.

Тон и темы, все содержание.<sup>48</sup>

For Rozanov, the 1860s remained the far more powerful phenomenon in Russian literature: 'По яркости, выпуклости и самобытности таланта ни один из декадентских поэтов не поднялся даже до уровня Некрасова.'<sup>49</sup> Rozanov's articles for Novyi put' on the men of the sixties show a nostalgia for the idealism of this period in contrast to the 'greyness' of contemporary life:

Итак, идеал 60-х годов был «утилитарный», но в каком-то пророчественном, священном смысле. <...> Живя теперь в серенькое и нерешительное время, время не сотворяющее никаких идей, время не питаемых ни в какую сторону надежд, нельзя с особенною силою не почувствовать красоты 60-х годов, en masse.<sup>50</sup>

Rozanov criticized the decadents for putting forward the principle of creative individualism at any cost. The decadents lacked the corresponding originality of talent to justify their individualism:

В тысячный раз приходится убедиться, <...> до чего с пресловутым «индивидуализмом», оторванностью личной души мы приходим не якобы к углублению ее, а иногда к простой торговой бессовестности. «Никого не было; все я один»... Я указываю на начало индивидуальности, так как его очень выдвигают декаденты, как специальное христианское чувство,

как свое чувство, в религиозно-философских собраниях.<sup>51</sup>

Rozanov is particularly critical of the mood of self-indulgent longing in literature: 'это - тоска отъединения, одиночества, глубокого эгоизма! И только... И ничего тут «демонического» нет <...>. Это недалекий «демонизм» всякой черствой натуры, не могущей переступить за свое «я».'<sup>52</sup> This was not a deepening of the self, rather a need to publish without any justifying creative depth: 'Человек не хочет и не умеет более о себе молчать: всякое малейшее чувство, всякую новую шевельнувшуюся мысль он торопится высказать другим <...> непременно закрепить печатным станком.'<sup>53</sup>

In this respect, Gippius' criticism of contemporary writing shows interesting similarities to Rozanov's. In the article 'Dekadenstvo i obshchestvennost'' she describes the replacing of true individuality by egoism in decadence:

Индивидуалист обостряет свое сознание личности на <...> почве чувства общности, связанности с другими личностями. У декадента нет этой почвы, нет никакого чувства общности, связанности, - ни малейшего. Он просто не подозревает, что есть другие, кроме него. Не имея нужной почвы, фона - он не имеет, в собственном смысле слова, и сознания личности.<sup>54</sup>

Like Rozanov, Gippius argues that it is only on the basis of a sense of connection with others that a true individuality can be developed. The 'decadents' have so



little sense of belonging to the real world that they hardly bother to make their thoughts explicit. They are singing only for themselves. Rozanov was as aware of the need for a renewed sense of connection as Gippius, but unlike her, he saw socialism as symptomatic of this need, not as its cure. Gippius's analysis of the distancing and loss of communicative words in society is almost identical to Rozanov's own diagnosis. Yet Gippius claimed Rozanov himself to be an example of this loss:

<...> люди, изменяясь и расширяясь и, главное - доходя до сознания своей «личности», все более и более разобщались, теряли единозначущия слова, и теперь почти ничего не могут передать друг другу <...>. Розанов, этот великий «плотовидец» (как бывают духовидцы) - пишет полусловами-полузнаками, из звуков творя небывалые слова и небывалые их сочетания.<sup>55</sup>

In a review of Uedinennoe, Gippius, writing as Anton Krainii, accused Rozanov of precisely the egoistic isolation that he had condemned in the decadents. Her demands for a greater demonstration of true character, or 'lichnost', in contemporary literature at first echoes much of Rozanov's own writing: 'Для того же, чтобы иметь и что сказать, недостаточно быть литератором: надо быть еще и человеком, личностью <...>. Личного, личностей сейчас очень мало в нашей прекрасной литературе.'<sup>56</sup> However, Gippius accuses Rozanov of an exaggerated sense of this

individual character. Rozanov shows a lively, responsive individuality, but an immense egoism that professes indifference to any phenomena except himself. Gippius cites the passages where Rozanov speaks of lacking a sense of contemporaries. She protests against the detrimental effects of his claimed indifference to morality, his antipathy to social issues and to the term 'obshchestvennost'. She even argues that a book that is so fundamentally individualist has no right to exist in print, despite Rozanov's literary talent. It contains thoughts that no one would dream of making public. Gippius argues that this unrestricted growth of personality is as detrimental to its source as its suppression in contemporary culture: 'Болезненное-уродливое переразвитие «самости», - личности, - лишает человека его человеческих свойств и, в конце-концов, как это ни странно, - лишает его той же «личности».'<sup>57</sup> This statement about Rozanov is itself an echo of Rozanov's criticisms of the decadents. Rozanov replied to Gippius's complaint that Uedinennoe should not exist in a continuation of his supposedly impermissible genre, arguing that this was the only form in which books should exist:

«Такой книге нельзя быть» (Гип. об «Уед.»). С одной стороны, это так, и это я чувствовал, отдавая в набор.<...> Но с другой стороны, столь же истинно, что этой книге непременно надо быть, и у меня даже мелькала мысль, что, собственно, все книги - и должны быть такие, т.е. «не

причесываясь» и «не надевая калсон». В сущности «в кальсонах» (аллегорически) все люди неинтересны.

[O. 1. II: 368]

As discussed in the first part, Rozanov believed in the value of his literary nakedness, it was a stance by which he sought to undermine illusory authorities and false posturing. He also claimed that it was a device by which he sought to overcome the distancing between people in society.<sup>58</sup> However, his 'nakedness' was also an assertion of a defiant self-accountability that Gippius and others interpreted as an evasion of responsibility. Gippius believed that Rozanov's 'nakedness' was too much of a subjective freedom and thus allowed, paradoxically, for further self-concealment, an evasion of communication with the other, and of the other's judgement through an absolute defiance of one's individual truth. Rozanov himself used the opavshie list'ia genre to expose his own self-critical debate over whether his writing was an act of immense compassion or 'Neronic' egoism.<sup>59</sup>

Both Rozanov and Gippius wrote about decadence without specifically associating themselves with the movement, and both held up each other as exemplifying the shortcomings of decadence. These shortcomings, which they exemplified in the other, were often similar. Rozanov's and Gippius's articles on contemporary life and writing frequently address common concerns, which are seemingly contradicted whenever they discuss each other directly in print.

Rozanov's writing about Gippius, and Gippius's critical writing on Rozanov, excluding her posthumous reminiscences in Zhivye litsa, would suggest enmity and incomprehension. However, contemporary accounts of their relationship suggest that there were meeting points between the two.<sup>60</sup> Gippius's biographer, Temira Pachmuss, writes of a mutual attraction between Gippius and Rozanov in the early days of their acquaintance.<sup>61</sup> Gippius admired Rozanov's insight and even genius in his penetration into the smallest details of contemporary life. However, she also saw him as a maverick individualist, unconcerned with the common political cause, and willing to risk the consequences of the most irresponsible extravagances of self-affirmation and provocative political pronouncements. Yet Rozanov's solitude continually stated its aim, which was to renew its connection to the world of people and things as well as to God.

Nevertheless the continued portrayal of Rozanov by his contemporaries was as a defiant individualist, who was frequently compared to Nietzsche. Merezhkovskii was the first to call Rozanov the 'Russian Nietzsche'.<sup>62</sup> Rozanov's attacks on the hypocrisy of contemporary Christianity and morality, his defence of individual creative freedom and of spontaneous response to nature against scholasticism furthered the comparisons. In a letter to Pertsov Rozanov claimed that he had no desire to read Nietzsche: 'Вообще есть нравственная правда, которая состоит: Никого не обидь! (с этой точки я ненавижу Ницше, и просто не хочу его

читать: только не говорите Фил<ософову> и Мер<ежковскому>.'<sup>63</sup> He increasingly described the Nietzschean influences in pre-revolutionary Russia, as well as the decadent phenomena of demonism, mysticism and apocalyptic foreboding, as superficial and self-indulgent. The mania for Nietzsche, or for the simplified slogans that Nietzscheanism had become amongst much of the contemporary reading public, stimulated the hyperbolic individualism that Rozanov criticized in contemporary literature. Korzhavin emphasizes this effect of Nietzscheanism in Russian intellectual life: 'Не о сложности человеческих ситуаций тут речь, а только о безграничном праве неповторимых личностей на самовыражение и самоутверждение.'<sup>64</sup> Self-expression was an inalienable part of Rozanov's existence, but Rozanov maintained that this self-expression was dependent on God. Rozanov always protested against the absurdity of associations with Nietzsche, emphasizing his own weakness, softness and awkwardness, although assertion was an equally strong part of his nature. Rozanov claimed to 'summon God', but he equally emphasized his need for and dependence on God, for whom he was 'little', seeking God's comfort and protection.

#### BLOK AND ROZANOV

Blok showed an ambiguity towards the decadent movement, characteristic of figures who were themselves considered leading decadents. Unlike the early symbolists or the futurists, decadence was a movement that no-one seemed

quite sure that they wanted to belong to. Instead they would flirt with the term, associating themselves in a provocative and tentative rather than a decidedly assertive manner.<sup>65</sup> In notes for an article on contemporary poetry, written in the winter of 1901-02, Blok distinguishes between 'good' and 'bad' types of decadence. He describes the detrimental effects on literature when a lack of talent seeks to escape detection in a fashionable obscurity.<sup>66</sup> Yet in 1909 Blok wrote to Rozanov that it was important to accept the term 'decadence', arguing that it was impossible to be an active contemporary writer and not be implicated with decadence in some way: 'Я не отрицаю, что я повинен в декадентстве, но кто теперь в нем не повинен, кроме мертвецов? Думаю что и Вы его не избегли, потому что оно - очень глубокое и разностороннее явление.'<sup>67</sup>

Rozanov and Blok were more closely involved than might be expected from their distinctly different literary personas. Although they expressed themselves quite differently in their lives, manner and work, they both deeply valued the specifically Russian tradition of literature and culture, particularly in its neglected aspects, such as the writings of Apollon Grigor'ev. Even their journalistic altercations reveal an intensity of engagement with each other's writing which suggests that they could not ignore each other. Although both writers are crucially important innovators in Russian literary history, they valued the traditions that had formed their culture and saw their own work as emerging from these traditions.<sup>68</sup>

Even in their polemical exchange of letters in 1909, discussed below, both writers used images from the Russian tradition to justify their political views.<sup>69</sup> They showed a similar ambivalence in their approach to literary movements such as decadence. Blok shared Rozanov's anxiety about decadence being remote from real life, both in its literary output and its mental attitude. In a letter to his mother he emphasizes, like Rozanov, the importance of real life as the motivation and strength of valuable work: 'весь яд декаденства и состоит в том, что утрачен сочность, яркость, жизненность, образность, не только типичное, но и характерное <...>. А в жизни еще много сочности, которую художник должен воплощать.'<sup>70</sup> Like Rozanov, Blok did not believe that this sense of the central importance of living life should exclude the more mysterious aspects of this life. Blok was himself very much drawn towards the areas that Rozanov called 'unclear', to mystical speculation and apocalyptic foreboding.<sup>71</sup> Yet like Rozanov he was impatient with the superficiality of the decadent movement, as well as the poverty of much of the actual writing.<sup>72</sup> Blok's notebooks and letters show a distance from the early fervent activity of the Merezhkovskis and also Rozanov. He was particularly frustrated by the activity of the Religious and Philosophical Society, which he thought was diverting the attention of the intelligentsia from their responsibilities to the people into futile religious discussions.<sup>73</sup>

Blok valued Rozanov's insights into Russian life and

his extreme perception about contemporary literary figures. He quotes Rozanov's judgements in his own articles on Gor'kii, Andreev and Merezhkovskii, although he argues that this perception was at times masked by the flow of journalistic polemic. Blok and Rozanov had a similar attitude to Gor'kii. They valued his writing less for its literary merit than for what Rozanov termed, and Blok quoted, the 'boundlessness of his ideal' and the genuineness of his anxiety for Russia.<sup>74</sup> Blok valued the profundity of Rozanov's own thought far more than his journalistic activity. He emphasizes in particular the power of Rozanov's solitary and individual questioning: 'И не нововременством своим и не «религиозно-философской» деятельностью дорог нам Розанов, а тайной своей, однодумьем своим, темными и страстными песнями о любви.'<sup>75</sup> Blok considered Opavshie list'ia a work of extreme importance for Russia and compared it with the writings of Apollon Grigor'ev, in an article introducing a new edition of Grigor'ev's works: 'И какая близость с самой яркой современностью, с «Опавшими листьями» Розанова. Ведь эти отрывки из писем, те же «опавшие листья».'<sup>76</sup> In 1913 he wrote in a letter to Otrokovskii: 'Прочтите замечательную книгу Розанова «Опавшие листья». Сколько там глубокого о печати, о литературе, о писательстве, а главное - о жизни.'<sup>77</sup>

Blok argued that it was the responsiveness to immediate life that was the strength of Rozanov's writerly insights. He did not believe that Rozanov's essential



genius was for metaphysical speculation, but lay in his penetrative human insight, very much rooted in this world.<sup>78</sup> Again drawing a parallel with a recent figure from the conservative and national literary tradition, Blok compared Rozanov's lack of true recognition to the fate of Dostoevskii, who was also seen as a reactionary and whose most valuable insights were not realized until after his death.<sup>79</sup> He saw this as the gulf, in both men, between their most personal insights and their public role: 'Розанов не умер, и ему не могут простить того, что он сотрудничает в каком-то «Новом времени». Надо, чтобы человек умер, чтобы прошло после этого пятьдесят лет. Тогда только «Опавшие листья» увидят свет божий.'<sup>80</sup>

Blok had earlier written to Rozanov about his concern that his true merit was being concealed by the public perception of him as a reactionary journalist for Novoe vremia: 'Великая тайна, и для меня очень страшная, - то, что во многих русских писателях (и в Вас теперь) сплетаются такие непримиримые противоречия, как дух глубины и пытливости и дух... «Нового времени».'<sup>81</sup> In the same letter Blok reproached Rozanov for addressing him as a 'decadent', in a pejorative tone; if he was to follow this example, he argues, then he should call Rozanov a 'novovremenets', instead of a 'profound mystic' or an 'outstanding writer'.<sup>82</sup> Blok's repeated hostility to Novoe vremia in particular should be understood with the caution that he and his family were readers of the paper until 1905, after which Blok stopped reading it. His antipathy is thus partly

a symbolic antipathy, an attempt to break with the political atmosphere of his upbringing and move towards a more radical position.

A comparison of both mens' views after the 1905 revolution is more revealing than the split and relative political positions of Rozanov and the Merezhkovskiis. Despite a fervent public polemic, they showed certain similar sympathies. Blok was far more perceptive about the contribution of Rozanov's writing, particularly of Uedinennoe and Opavshie list'ia, than Gippius ever was. Both recognized the importance of the liberal intelligentsia of the 1860s, and compared the power of that period to the poverty of contemporary debate, particularly in the press. Yet in the article 'Popy, zhandarmy i Blok', Rozanov accused Blok of a lack of responsibility to Russia's cultural tradition. He accused him of a decadent and apocalyptic pose that did not have the interests of the Russian people at heart. He attacked Blok together with the decadents and the new generation of 'idealists', writers such as Bulgakov, Askol'dov, Sergei and Evgenii Trubetskoi, for claiming originality, and not acknowledging the tradition of which he had hoped that they would prove the fruitful heirs: 'как будто в России до них и идеализма не существовало, как будто они благодетельствовали Россию, начав в ней говорить об «идеализме»'.<sup>83</sup> He cites the achievements of Solov'ev, Strakhov and Leont'ev as thinkers who had kept alight these original questions against the current of radical theory and protests against the

absurdity of dismissing their contribution:

<...> для чего же это забвение? Что за братство в истории, что за единство культуры <...> если каждый из нас, выскакивая, начнет бить себя в перси и кричать: «Я», «Я», «Я». «Я все начал, от меня все пошло...»

О, эти христиане - индивидуалисты, без языческого «культа предков», без чувства рода, племени, родины!<sup>84</sup>

Rozanov urged a return to a recognition of a shared culture, based on ties of blood and religious needs as the remedy for this isolation. He criticized the religious themes expressed in the debates of the decadents as abstract and remote from the ritualistic, factual Russian tradition to which Rozanov adhered despite his complaints against the Church. Rozanov reasserts the importance of the religious cult, and the Church or 'khram', in popular life. This was the essential poetry of the people, far removed from the obscure and lurid literary novelties of the decadents. Rozanov believed that the decadents should recognize the power of these traditional sources of Russian religiosity: 'Не пора ли опознаться Блоку и другим декадентам, в некоторых мы не отрицаем лучших «возможностей», и из бесплодных пустынь отрицания перейти на сторону этих столпов русской жизни, ее твердь, ее тружеников и охранителей.'<sup>85</sup>

Blok replied to Rozanov in a letter warning against a sentimental attachment to the Church which had become a

tyrannical institution: 'Я не пойду к пасхальной заутрене к Исакию, потому что не могу различить, что блестит: солдатская каска или икона <...>. Все это мне по крови отвратительно.'<sup>86</sup> In his reply to this letter, Rozanov appeals to this very liberal 'blood' in Blok:

<...> даже кровная интеллигентность не понимает плачущего мужика, <...> не постигает тютчевских «бедных селений» <...>. Плачущий старик, <...> пусть весь он полон «суеверия и непонимания» - есть столь же прекрасное, благородное и вековое явление, как Ваш дед Бекетов. Почему им бы не обняться?! Да почему, что мешает?! Загадка всей русской истории.<sup>87</sup>

In his reply, Blok was not swayed by Rozanov's images of popular devotion. His intellectual critique of the corrupt and compromised Orthodox Church was combined with an idealistic vision of a powerful new young Russia, that he claimed was anticipated in the Russian literary tradition: 'Нам завещана в фрагментах русской литературы от Пушкина и Гоголя до Толстого, во вздохах измученных русских общественных деятелей XIX века, в светлых и неподкупных, лишь временно помутившихся взорах русских мужиков - огромная <...> концепция живой, могучей и юной России.'<sup>88</sup>

In this letter Blok explicitly justifies revolutionary terrorism, although it has been argued that this declaration was 'polemically provoked' by Rozanov.<sup>89</sup> In earlier articles, Rozanov had also expressed his attracted

to the simple idealism of the young revolutionaries.<sup>90</sup> By July of the same year, Blok distinguished his vision of a new Russia from what he saw as Rozanov's nostalgic and retrograde conservatism, yet his words are not so remote from Rozanov's earlier writing, particularly his reference to Dostoevskii's prophetic musical exposition:

Я (мы) не с теми, кто за старую Россию (Союз русского народа, сюда и Розанов!) не с теми, кто за европеизм <...>, но за новую Россию, какую-то, или - за «никакую» <...>. Это и есть ОПЯТЬ - песня о «новом гражданине» (какого пророчили и пророчат - например Достоевский, но пророчат не на деле, а только в песне).<sup>91</sup>

Rozanov's post-revolutionary writing returned to interests and sympathies that were closer to Blok's own. In 1919 Blok asked Rozanov's daughter if she could send him Apokalipsis nashego vremeni, of which he only had the fifth issue, urging that he had great need of the book.<sup>92</sup> Sergei Hackel has argued that Rozanov's response to the revolution in Apokalipsis nashego vremeni, with its depiction of the revolution in apocalyptic terms and emphasis on the end of Christianity in Russia, influenced images in Blok's Dvenadtsat'.<sup>93</sup>

## CHAPTER VII: LITERARY SECTARIANISM AND APOCALYPSE

Heretics and sectarianism have been associated with millennial and apocalyptic expectations since the early Middle Ages. The mood in Russia at the end of the nineteenth century also showed a resurgence of interest in both. This was as much a literary as a social phenomenon. There was a tradition of literary interest and engagement in religious sectarianism in Russia. Sectarian themes are present in the writing of both Tolstoi and Dostoevskii. At the turn of the century writers were interested in the habits and activity of popular religious sects and explicitly identified their own activities with them. Andrei Belyi described his early interest in Rozanov and the Merezhkovskiis as an interest in new types of sectarians, as the 'initiators of their own sects'.<sup>1</sup> Berdiaev also described a sectarian mood in Petersburg before the revolution. Gippius was known to be involved with some sectarian groups; an 1893 diary entry notes a proposed visit to the khlysty, suggesting that she was in some way involved with the community: 'пойду к х-там. Ведь я записана в Думе.'<sup>2</sup> In a diary entry of 1921, Prishvin compared Rozanov and Merezhkovskii to the sectarians, who sought religion outside the official Church: 'Христос за церковной оградой (Толстой, Достоевский, Мережковский, Розанов, сектанты)'.<sup>3</sup>

At the time of the founding of the Religious and Philosophical Society the Merezhkovskiis were making visits

to sects and schismatic monasteries. The sectarians were frequently discussed or referred to at the meetings of the Society. Members of the decadent movement were drawn to the sectarian movements, either through curiosity, or because there were indeed parallels between the decadent opposition to the established forms of religion and culture and the sectarians' own rebellion. Rozanov made a visit to some khlysty near St Petersburg with the Merezhkovskiis. In 1914 he published a book about his encounter: Apokalipsicheskaia sekta.<sup>4</sup> His interest is also evident in articles for his collections Religiia i kul'tura and Okolo tserkovnykh sten, and in the book Temnyi lik.

Rozanov saw sectarianism as a symptom of extreme spiritual anxiety, which is denied a responsive outlet. He depicts the sectarians as devout believers, and emphasizes the respect and affection which the khlysty show for the Orthodox Church. He saw the sectarians as a source of truly creative and spontaneous words:

Мы хотим <...> сказать, что вольнолюбивая и страдальческая мысль человеческая и сердце человеческое давно переросли условную и искусственную фразеологию богословия и богословов. <...>

Живы, энергичны теперь только секты, которые именно в движении поставили себе задачу.<sup>5</sup>

Ну, если взять, напр., наше русское сектанство <...>, то ведь уже одно оно во всяком случае не говорит о «потухшем

кратере человечества». Мало ли там чего есть.<sup>6</sup>

Rozanov's intense interest in sectarianism and its relation to official belief has close links with his literary activity. In the essay of 1896, 'Psikhologiya russkogo raskola', Rozanov describes the impulse of sectarianism in terms of the religious tradition of the Word, man's need for creative utterance and communication with God, and the impulse to resist finalizing forms. Much of this essay can be read as a description of Rozanov's own attitude to his need for and use of the word in his writing, although he does not associate himself with the sectarians. He talks of the 'nearness' of God for the sectarians, and of their communication with God in ways that anticipate the descriptions of his own writing in the opavshie list'ia genre: 'молитва <...> - для них - это общение с Богом, это слияние сил своих с Божескими, некоторое состояние экстаза, исполненное движения.'<sup>7</sup> Rozanov writes about the schism as a possible source of salvation. He argued that its spiritual energy should be tapped and channelled into all forms of existence:

Нужно помнить об оригинальном и огромном движении, которое испытала русская душа в расколе, об этой бездне инициативы, акции, суровой борьбы и поэзии. <...> Все то деятельное и живое, что есть в расколе, то «духовное пиво», которым он бесформенно напоял до сих пор христианскую душу, - это должно быть бережно сохранено, должно быть взято нами, как



сторона истинная в нем, и разлито по всем формам нашего бытия.<sup>8</sup>

Literature was the form of existence which Rozanov was most concerned to reinvigorate. His writings on sectarians continually emphasize their sense of the living word, the free and creative word of prophecy, against words that are bloodless and rhetorical. Rozanov's writing became an essential need and freedom, just as spontaneous prayer was for the sectarians. He saw his writing as a 'monastery', a solitary focusing of the spirit in God. He calls his opavshie list'ia 'my soul'. His writing could be seen as a model of art as sectarianism, making a bid for spontaneous individual religious creation, and claiming authority in God, when existing religious institutions are no longer responsive to peoples's spiritual needs. He exhorts his readers to seek refuge in sects, as 'the last citadels of the spirit':

Секты, сектанство - вот что нужно. Запирайтесь, люди, в секты: это последние цитадельки духа. Запирайтесь в них; и откатывайтесь в сторонку.

Церковь, «Храмина Вечного» - ведь тоже опозитивела. И м. б. ее-то позитивизм и идет впереди всего. Слова у нее все древние, а чувства все новые, новенькие...<sup>9</sup>

Ivask describes Rozanov's sympathy, demonstrated in Apokalipsicheskaia sekta, towards the sects, whom he saw as

deeply spiritual, like the 'last beautiful people on earth'.<sup>10</sup> Rozanov's descriptions of sectarian life are reminiscent in tone of his evocations of ancient cultures, and his juxtaposition of Dostoevskii's Son smeshnogo cheloveka with pictures of Ancient Egyptian groups and families in Semeinyi vopros v Rossii. Ivask notes the many sectarian motifs in Rozanov's writing. He interprets Rozanov's appeal for religious spontaneity and intimacy between people as proof of his sectarian sympathies. There are clear parallels between the sectarian approach to religion and the religious attitudes that Rozanov expressed in his writing. The sectarians were noted for their freedom and waywardness in interpreting the religious tradition. They emphasized the individual's spiritual potential and his freedom in relationship with God. Rozanov's refusal of external authority, his claims of having authority in God for his freedom of speech, his assertion that people should forget the weight of book authority and be responsible only to their own lives and the writing of their own opavshie list'ia, as well as his explicit linking of prayer with dance and celebration, make him a possible literary sectarian, as well as an heretic in his writings on Christ. Rozanov admired the intimacy of these people, their instinctive religious nature, and their audacity, being frequently from poor and uneducated backgrounds, to take responsibility for their own relationship with God. In the article 'Psikhologiiia russkogo raskola' he describes the way that the sectarian dukhobortsy would greet each other

by bowing to the ground before 'the image and likeness of God', and he notes with approval the freedom with which they used words in religion, in creative prophecy.<sup>11</sup> It is probable that Rozanov saw the popular sectarian creative activity in prayer, music and dance as a far more genuine, and more purely motivated, verbal creation than the refined literary attempts of the symbolists and decadents. Khovin writes that it was natural that Rozanov should have felt this sympathy:

Говоря о сектантах, о пророчествованиях их перед кругом братьев и сестер, о кружениях хлыстовских, пишет Розанов, что нужно же им (сектантам) в чемнибудь, какнибудь «вывертеть дух» свой.

Вывертеть дух?!

Кому же, как не Розанову, знать про это: весь он в вывертах духа, в уродствах его.<sup>12</sup>

Prishvin's notebooks record Rozanov's comments on the sectarian characteristics of his contemporaries. Reading Blok in 1940, Prishvin remembers how Rozanov had pointed out Blok to him at the Religious and Philosophical Society: 'Розанов из толпы людей вытащил за рукав Блока и сказал мне: - Вот наш хлыст, и их много, все хлысты.'<sup>13</sup> Prishvin's notebooks are valuable for giving a member of the younger generation's impressions of the atmosphere in St Petersburg before the revolution. They show the strong influence of Rozanov's ideas and imagery. Prishvin noted Rozanov's

identification of the decadents as sectarians, which perhaps influenced his own beliefs, since he repeated in his notebooks an almost superstitious designation of the Merezhkovskiis as khlysty. His diary entries for 1914 share with Rozanov's unpublished Mimoletnoe of the same year a sense of repulsion and hyperbole in the characterization of the Merezhkovskiis. Like Rozanov, he describes Merezhkovskii as lacking flesh and blood, and Gippius is caricatured as a prostitute with a cigarette between her lips.<sup>14</sup> Prishvin contrasts Blok and Rozanov, distinguishing them respectively as 'European' and 'Russian' decadent-sectarians. He compares Rozanov to Legkobytov, the founder of a sect of khlysty:

Есть секта служителей красоты в Петербурге: декаденты. Изучить их историю.

<...> Красота есть тоже бог.<...> Если стать на европейскую точку зрения, то можно оторваться от своего народного, от природы, Отца. Вот таковы декаденты, напр <имер> Блок. Если же стать на народную точку зрения, то в корне восстать на Европу, Христа - как сделал Розанов. Легкобытов есть верующий Розанов. Он для меня больше народ, чем, быть может, весь народ.<sup>15</sup>

The interest in sectarianism is closely bound up in apocalyptic expectation, as was evident in the title of Rozanov's book Apokalsicheskaia sekta. Rozanov emphasized this in his essay Russkaia Tserkov': 'Староверы русские и

вообще все русские секты упрекают не только в ошибках и изменах правительственную русскую веру, но иначе и не называют ее, постоянно и громко, как «царством Антихриста». И притом с убеждением и пылом, какого на Западе не сумеют представить себе!»<sup>16</sup>

Avril Pyman has argued that the pre-revolutionary atmosphere was marked equally by nostalgia for past ages as for a new age. The myth of a past era serves as a model for future anticipations.<sup>17</sup> Rozanov's nostalgic depictions of Ancient Egyptian and Judaic communities are of less importance as historical documents than as a conjuring of a longed for ideal existence and so a part of eschatological and apocalyptic expectation. Pyman argues that nostalgia itself can be for the future as much as for the past, for an imagined as much as for a once-lived existence. Rozanov himself explicitly connects ancient religions, Ancient Egypt and paganism with the ideal life of a future age in his Apokalipsis nashego vremeni. He uses Zosima's words from Brat'ia Karamazovy to explain a future existence that was anticipated in ancient religions.<sup>18</sup> Rozanov's writings show a persistent nostalgia for a gentle, loving and sexually fertile community. He describes a mental and physical unity between people ('sliannost''). Apocalyptic sectarianism showed similar characteristics to those that Rozanov admired in ancient cultures and heralded in imagined new ages. The existences, both past and anticipated future, that Rozanov evokes, are marked by the primacy of physical spontaneous expression and language and

the absence of an authoritative written culture.

In Siniavskii's introduction to his book on Rozanov he describes a mood of intense, even apocalyptic expectation in society at the time, that yielded a new type of writer of this period, exemplified in part, though not fully, by Rozanov: 'В ней звучат угрожающие, пророческие, и даже апокалиптические ноты. Ведь дело происходит как бы при последних временах.'<sup>19</sup> This sense of 'last times' leads to a sharpened search for truth, God, religion, and for sources of true individuality, purpose or identity. David Bethea cites Berdiaev and Lotman in support of his thesis of a national 'apocalypse of consciousness' in Russia.<sup>20</sup> He seeks to explore the relation between the apocalyptic mentality and literature, seeing the revolution as a model for apocalyptic revelation. He writes of the symbolist pre-revolutionary period as a period of unparalleled richness and breadth in Russian literature, citing the work of Solov'ev, Merezhkovskii, Rozanov, Blok and Belyi amongst others.<sup>21</sup>

Losev exemplified this Russian mixture of prophecy and expectation when he wrote in 1918:

Настал тягостный и жуткий период какой-то только еще предчувствуемой апокалиптики. Как отмечалось выше, русская философия никогда не занималась чем-либо другим, помимо души, личности и внутреннего «подвига». И вот эта душа, эта личность и этот внутренний поступок теперь содрогнулись в мистическом ужасе, в жутком ожидании конца.<sup>22</sup>

Losev claimed that Dostoevskii was central to the new apocalyptic sensibility. He singled out Brat'ia Karamazovy in particular for its prophetic anticipation of the world's end.<sup>23</sup> In Nachalo veka, Belyi describes the apocalyptic interest amongst the Russian literary intelligentsia before the revolution.<sup>24</sup> Belyi wrote to Florenskii about his sense of apocalypse, claiming that he sought confirmation of his sense of foreboding in the writing of Solov'ev, who was far more powerful and 'apocalyptic' for him than Dostoevskii: 'Если бы Достоевский обладал той степенью прозорливости, как Вл. Соловьев, то вместо «Братьев Карамазовых» мы имели бы «Апокалипсис».'<sup>25</sup> Belyi notes the subsequent apocalyptics, naming Rozanov, Merezhkovskii, Blok and Anna Shmidt.<sup>26</sup>

Rozanov's preoccupation with the Book of Revelation was a constant in his writing, and not only in the most obvious, late example of this, Apokalipsis nashego vremeni. Rozanov developed his own idiosyncratic combination of apocalypse with the everyday in his journalism. In an article for Novyi put' of 1904, he attacked the moral judgements made by society on unmarried mothers, claiming that he was fighting against a 'demonism' in society, and citing this as a sign of the last days:

Вот это-то и страшно, что забрались они в безпредельную вышину, и «духом уст своих» (тоже - не физически, не прямо, а косвенно, в своем роде «тоном» и «духом» учения) «убивают праведных», - как сказано в

Апокалипсисе о том, кто «наречет себя Богом» и велит себе поклониться <...>.

«Тайна беззакония уже начала действовать », сказал еще Апостол. «Тайна беззакония» лежит в том, что люди неодолимо начали чувствовать соблазнение: «отныне вы станете яко бози».<sup>27</sup>

Yet while claiming real evidence of apocalypse in these neglected social issues, Rozanov condemned what he saw as an artificial and merely literary apocalyptic mood among the decadents. He argued that the decadents had lowered apocalypticism to a literary pose, remote from the concerns of real life:

Суть-то декадентов в том и состоит, что они ничего не чувствуют и что «хоть половина Сицилии провалится, то тем лучше, потому что тем апокалиптичнее». Им важен Апокалипсис, а не люди; и важно впечатление слушателей. <...> Важна картина, яркость и впечатление.<sup>28</sup>

Rozanov believed that marriage and childbirth were the truly urgent and 'apocalyptic' issues. Yet Belyi accused Rozanov of a trivialization of the apocalypse by combining it with his personal themes: '«Апокалипсис» культивировал Розанов, но разбазаривал чувство «конца», «катастрофу», в раскрытие «тайн» половых, сочетая с ним «ветхий завет».'<sup>29</sup> Rozanov, on the other hand, argued that a true sense of the apocalypse was rooted in day to day reality and



observation, and dismissed much of the apocalyptic writing of contemporaries as a melodramatic concern with literary effect.

In 1913, Rozanov describes the birth of apocalyptic expectation amongst Russian writers and thinkers and includes himself amongst those who had an 'inner sense' of apocalypse. He claims that Dostoevskii was the first to sense what was to become a fact of Russian life, the anticipation of an impending crisis or 'ending'. He argues that Strakhov and Rachinskii's opposition to his use of the biblical Apocalypse in the text of his Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore represented the limitations of their outlook, and of the outlook of the time, that Dostoevskii alone saw beyond:

Кроме одного Достоевского, «чувство Апокалипсиса» вообще не было пробуждено в нашем обществе 80-х годов. Тогда именно все «пролетели через другие миры», - и когда мы влетели «вот в наш мир» - чувство Апокалипсиса «у всех пробудилось». Мнение Страхова и Рачинского - просто странно «для нас», для Мережковского, Розанова, Евг. П. Иванова, для всего круга «Религиозно-философского общества». Для нас «Апокалипсис» - свой, то есть «точно будто стал своим», «душевым». Мне он страшно был близок в пору писания «Легенды об инквизиторе».

[Lit. izg.: 253, n.1]

David Bethea interprets the use of the apocalypse myth

as a bid for freedom, an attempt to break with the traditional cultural categories of oppositions, of old and new, East and West, that had weighed down Russian consciousness throughout the nineteenth century. He argues that the myth of the apocalypse had such appeal because it promised to replace myths of sporadic renewal and reversal that had dominated the intelligentsia for years. He sees Rozanov as a prime activist in this process. Rozanov's apocalypse is seen as personal as much as political, enacted through his writing. Bethea argues that Rozanov's modernism, his stylistic innovations and creation of genre, was the work of a literary anarchist and the personal embodiment of the apocalypse of Russian literature:

Rozanov, who insouciantly demolished generic boundaries, mixed fact and fiction, and placed statements of the most intimate lyrical pathos alongside statements of riotous buffoonery <...> became the Bakunin of Silver Age prose. Perhaps better than anyone it was this combination of philosopher and *pater familias* in a soiled dressing gown <...> who epitomized the sense of simultaneous anarchy and faith, "openness" and "closure", hanging over his generation.<sup>30</sup>

Rozanov responded to the apocalyptic atmosphere of the pre-revolutionary years in a typically personal way. He carried out both a 'public' and 'private' apocalypse. Indeed he mixes the two, using the defence of his own absolute self-

accountability and autonomy to strengthen the sense of his public apocalypse. Rozanov declared that he measured the world from his own personal experience. His literary apocalypse demonstrated how much the world created by his writing had become the only place of existence for Rozanov by this time. It had become a private refuge from the public and literary world. Yet it was the apotheosis of his literary activity. Rozanov's late writing became a public demonstration of the contradictions in 'his soul', as he called the opavshie list'ia genre.<sup>31</sup>

Rozanov was aware of these contradictions in his writing. He described his own writing, and through it the whole of literature, disintegrating through its own dialectical contradictions, as though he were a microcosm of literary apocalypse:

...иногда кажется, что во мне происходит разложение литературы, самого существа ее. И может быть, это есть мое мировое «emploi». <...> явно во мне есть какое-то завершение литературы; литературности; ее существа - как потребности отразить и выразить. <...> И у меня мелькает странное чувство, что я последний писатель, с которым литература вообще прекратится скоро. Люди станут просто жить, считая смешным, и ненужным, и отвратительным литераторствовать. От этого, может быть, у меня и сознание какого-то «последнего несчастья», сливающегося в моем чувстве с «я». «Я» это ужасно, гадко, огромно, трагично последней трагедией: ибо в нем как-то диалектически

«разломилось и исчезло» колоссальное тысячелетнее «я» литературы.

[О. 1. II: 332-33]

Rozanov declares that he might be the writer with whom writing will end for good. He seeks an end to the writing that is crushing spontaneous life, and anticipates a new golden age where people will 'simply live'. In this new age Old Testament forms of worship, such as prophecy and song, would replace the scholastic and dogmatic book-learning of the New Testament. In Rozanov's Mimoletnoe, the apocalyptic impulses are increasingly frequent and direct. Rozanov's depiction of the new world that would emerge from this transformation was free from the domination of print and publishing, a return to a culture of manuscripts and handwriting. Even the apocalypse itself would bear the mark of its inescapable literariness: 'Вы думаете, конец света будет «в дыме и пламени»? Полноте, «конец света» будет просто в чистописании.'<sup>32</sup> Rozanov attacked the literary culture which he associated with Christianity in Apokalipsis nashego vremeni, where there is a vivid account of the living man trapped under a bookshelf:

<...> один тот факт, что «живой находится под шкафом», содействует какое-то содрогание в груди. «Как живой попал туда?» Но - «попал». Притом - кто? Любимейшее дитя Божие, которое от начала мира, от создания мира, было любимейшим.

<...>

Надавила и задавила вся христианская история. Столько комментариев. Столько «примечаний». Разве можно сдвинуть такие библиотеки. <...>

Но человек не умирает и все стонет. Хоть бы умер. Цивилизации легче было бы дышать. А то невозможно дышать. Все стоны, стоны.

Странная стонущая цивилизация.

[Апок.: 633]

In this passage Rozanov emphasizes that the libraries, and the symbolic bookshelf, fell upon the Jews. In a letter to Izmailov of 1918, Rozanov explicitly rejects the connection of his writing with the Russian and Christian literature that has led to Russia's downfall and calls himself 'the last Jewish prophet', emphasizing the fact that he saw his work as being in a far more broad context of a religiously active Word, distinct from the confines of 'cold' literature: 'Я же чистосердечно себя считаю ... почти не «русским писателем», но настоящим и воистину последним еврейским пророком.'<sup>33</sup>

The sense of apocalypse in Rozanov's writing is closely linked to his own constant evaluation of his own writing and its relation to Russian literary history. Rozanov was as aware as anyone that he had created something unique in the history of Russian literature, and his statements about this genre express a repeated faith in his role as a writer. Yet his writing had a clear intent: to counteract the negative and destructive effect of

literature and 'literariness' in Russian life. Rozanov thus describes himself as a warrior, in battle with literature, seeking victory and the annihilation of the negative tenets of literary nihilism, radicalism or satire, and any blind faith in printed phrases. Ironically, his remedy is a literary one, expressed through writing and publication. Yet Rozanov claimed that he was seeking to destroy literature:

МЫСЛЬ МОЯ БЫЛА И ЕСТЬ И ОСТАНЕТСЯ ВЗЛОМАТЬ ЛИТЕРАТУРУ. ПОДРУБИТЬ ТЕ ПОДМОСТКИ, НА КОТОРЫХ ОНА ПЯЛИТСЯ И ВЫПАЧИВАЕТ БРЮХО.

<...>

Я отрицаю, собственно, не очень много: Кантемира, Фонвизина, Грибоедова, Гоголя, вторую половину Толстого и всех «писателей 60-х годов» с «судебной реформой». Что же я отрицаю, собственно? Непонимание России и отрицание России.<sup>34</sup>

...русская литература есть несчастье русского народа.

...неужели Государь ее читал? Ее нужно просто выкинуть из школ. Неужели можно «воспитывать детей» на проклинании и на насмешке над своею родною землею и над своим родным народом?<sup>35</sup>

...болит душа за Россию.

...болит за ее нигилизм.

Если «да» (т. е. нигилизм) - тогда смерть, гроб. Тогда

не нужно жизни, бытия. «Если Россия будет нигилистичной» - то России нужно перестать быть, и нужно желать, чтобы она перестала быть.

<...>

Вот где зажата душа. Но как «нигилизм» пройдет, когда почти все нигилистично? <...>

Но во мне же он прошел? Но я - я. Большая разница «со всеми». <...>

Вот где зажата душа. Вот отчего болю. Вот отчего пишу.<sup>36</sup>

Rozanov writes that Russian literature will lead to the inevitable destruction of Russia itself. He sees its centre in the 'demon' Gogol and the 'devilish' laughter of his satire. Satire and mockery have replaced respectful love for Russian life and culture. In 1915, in the unpublished Mimoletnoe, Rozanov argues that the only conclusion of nineteenth century Russian literature is revolution:

Да вся литература (наша) XIX века и не имела другого устремления, как выесть душу человеческую и основать на месте ее

ПУСТОСЛОВИЕ.

<...>

Чего же я плачу-то, что литература ничего не понимает, ничего не чувствует. Вполне естественно...<sup>37</sup>

Пошлость. Мерзость. В тайной глубине своей Гоголь - именно мерзость.

Подумать, что он «понял и отразил нашу Русь», нашу Святую и прекрасную (во всех ее пороках) Русь, - с ее страданием, с ее многодумием, с ее сложностью - это просто глупо.

<...>

Ничего праведного, любящего, трогательного, глубокого не пошло от Гоголя. От него именно пошла одна мерзость. Вот это - пошло. И залило собою Русь.

.....  
.....

Нигилизм - немыслим без Гоголя и до Гоголя.<sup>38</sup>

Вся русская литература написана не на русские темы.

\*\*\*

Представьте себе целую литературу, - романы, рассказы, - где все говорится, шепчется, «взвивается, поется и глаголется» - о бомбочках, о том, как они «свели за взездами высокопоставленному лицу» <...>. Оставим литературу и взглянем на это как рекламу...

Ибо ведь литература - литературой, но ведь в ней volens-nolens для автора есть и сторона рекламная. <...>

Скажите, как же не быть «революции» в России, - столь рекламированной?<sup>39</sup>

Dostoevskii is an exception to the succession of literary detractors of Russia. Rozanov sees Dostoevskii as



a precursor of the Russian literary apocalypse, the only writer to penetrate what was essentially Russian, depicting 'русские перед Светопреставлением'.<sup>40</sup> Rozanov saw his own writing as embodying the essential Russianness that Dostoevskii had described, a 'subjective' insight and warmth that he believed made him the only true Russian writer after Dostoevskii: 'Ничье сердце на Руси не билось так сильно, так непрерывно... Ничей мозг не подумал о так многом.'<sup>41</sup> Rozanov wrote of giving his physical life to the literary event and in this way achieving a sort of redemption for Russia. He claimed that by his warmth and sense of suffering he could counteract the destructive effects of the legacy of Gogol' and the nihilists:

«Не читают», и все-таки я чувствую Победу.

Она в мозгу моем, Она в костях моих. Она в дыхании моем: я дышу сильнее, чем вы, и передышу вас.

<...>

Со мной Бог. А с вами нет ничего («нигилизм»)<sup>42</sup>

Как же, однако, через какой «механизм» я одолею Гоголя?

«О Розанове» будут столько же писать, как «о Гоголе» и собственно Розанов такая же «загадка» как «Гоголь».<...>

«Успех» Гоголя <...> весь и объясняется тем, что <...> он ничего и не говорил, и во-вторых, что он попал, совпал с самым гадким и пошлым в национальном характере - с цинизмом, с даром издевательства у русских, с силою

гогочущей толпы, которая <...> мнет и толчет слезы, идеализм и страдание (тут чувство моей Вари, многое мне объяснившее).

<...> У него бессодержательность и гордыня. Все формы - «как ни у кого» <...>. У меня - навозит. «Но в хлеве для загона скота родился наш Спаситель». Родилось бесконечное содержание. «Как из зерна - дерево». Элевзинские таинства. Везде Элевзинские таинства. «От тепленького - все».<sup>43</sup>

Rozanov claimed that Russian literature, particularly Gogol', had destroyed the sacred sense of the word, creating a people of cold theory and empty words, who ignore the suffering and words of those closest to them. Characteristically, Rozanov's images of his warmth and fecundity yields a comparison of himself both to Christ and to the dung in Christ's stable. The description of himself in Christ-like terms was increasingly insistent in the 1915 Mimoletnoe. Rozanov's attack on historical Christianity and the book tyranny that it had helped to produce were, paradoxically, accompanied by a literary assertion of his Christ-like role, as comforter and refuge of the weak. The assertion of the uniqueness of his role in Russian literature was pierced occasionally by doubts that he himself has been seduced by his own literary talent and betrayed the cause for which he was writing. The depiction of himself as a spiritual minister was an attempt to distance himself from this ambiguous literary role, yet this itself proved to be a literary pose. Rozanov could

only act and minister through his writing. He even claims that his books are the embodiment of this, they were like 'medicine'.<sup>44</sup> Rozanov appeals to the 'hidden and forgotten' existences of mothers, orphans, the weak, needy and downcast, but wards off students, or anyone who might approach him with preconceived expectations or literary ambition. He describes his writing as having a very specific, seemingly sacred role, for the comfort of souls. He uses the Christ-like phrase, 'come unto me':

- Буду ли я с значением? Проще - принес ли я пользу «нашим русским».

<...>

Господи, кому бы я хотел быть нужен?

Кто нуждается в утешении...

Кто одинок...

В особенности, в особенности - кого оставили.

Вы, некрасивые - идите ко мне. О, как мне не нужно красивых!! Не нужно, не нужно, как и никогда при жизни.

<...>

Сироты, мальчики...

Гимназисты...

Студенты? Ну, пусть проходят мимо. Не надо.

Вообще «хозяйки дома». Вдовы. Вот что «нуждаются в дровах». Все - мои.

Да. Но я-то им нужен ли?

Это другой вопрос. Они не читают. Им некогда читать.

Вот я истинный друг тех, кому «некогда читать».<sup>45</sup>

Ко мне придут (если когда-нибудь придут) нежные, плачущие, скорбные, измученные. Замученные. Придут блудливые (слабые)... Только пьяных не нужно...

И я скажу им: я всегда и был такой же слабый, как все вы, и даже слабее вас, и блудливый, и похотливый. Но всегда душа моя плакала об этой своей слабости.<...>

«Давайте устроимте Вечерю Господню... Вечерю чистую - один день из семи без блуда...

И запоем наши песни, песни Слабости Человеческой, песни Скорби Человеческой, песни Недостойнства Человеческого. В которых оплачем все это...

И на этот день Господь будет с нами».<sup>46</sup>

Все-таки я «Розанов Великолепный»: в общем изумительное зрелище труда, волнения, забот, сна и бессонницы <...>.

И темы...

Семья, школа, религия, церковь...

Прибежище жен, девиц, вдов. - Проституток.

«Под Розановым много места», и я как matka всех защитил.

<...>

Но 80 томов: какое зрелище золотистых переплетов.

- Ах, Розанов: а ведь Розанов ты не любил книгу?

Не любил. Кроме себя.<sup>47</sup>

Rozanov emphasizes the paradox both of his writing as being 'for those who have no time to read', and of the

immensity and splendour of his literary legacy in someone who directed so much energy at a challenge to literature. In Mimoletnoe and Posle Sakharny he repeatedly explores this paradox:

Вся личность и вся жизнь превращена в литературу...

<...>

Всякий - «сочинял». Я же никогда не «сочинял»: никогда ни единого плана «моего творения». Никогда не «задумывал». «Обдумывать» мне совершенно несродно («и вообразить не могу»).

Жил...

Я...

Вот и все. Потому я думаю, «полный человек» только «в моих сочинениях».<sup>48</sup>

Rozanov saw Uedinennoe and Opavshie List'ia as the key works in his literary revolution, and evidence of its sacred, as distinct from literary, nature. Characteristically, he justifies Uedinennoe as a self-crucifixion:

Безумно люблю свое «Уед.» и «Оп. л.». Пришло же на ум такое издавать. <...>

Только это люблю в своей литературе. Прочего не уважаю. «Сочинял книги». Старался быть «великолепным». <...>

«Уед.» и «Оп. л.» я считаю самым благородным, что

писал.

<...>

Сегодня мелькнуло на извознике: СВЯЩЕННОЕ ЕСТЬ. Это мой лозунг и привет миру. А всему говорю: «Здравствуй, СВЯЩЕННОЕ ЕСТЬ». Да, это мой суть.

Не ошибкой было бы сказать, что в «Уед.» и «Оп. л.» я стал как распятие.<sup>49</sup>

Rozanov's protest against literature was the translation of the passing moments of his private existence, which usually defy transcription, into the public form of literature.<sup>50</sup> He claimed that through his opavshie list'ia genre he would 'overcome' literature by pushing it to its extreme, so that its authority would collapse through its own contradictions. Writing would become subsumed by life. Ironically this meant that he increasingly identified his life with literature until his life could only be lived through his writing, so that his intentional contradictoriness threatened his own, not literature's collapse. In the battle with the printing press, print threatened to win, and consume Rozanov's life.

In Mimoletnoe, Rozanov expressed severe doubts about the opavshie list'ia genre. He feared that he may himself have been seduced by the pustoslovie that he condemned in all Russian literature.<sup>51</sup> He had hoped to restore a sacred sense of the word in his writing but asks whether he too has not been seduced by fame and literary ambition. He described his need to keep on writing, when he was on the

brink of conquering literature and giving the last word to literature, as a fatal temptation. The unpublished Mimoletnoe of 1915 is itself evidence of Rozanov's need to continue writing the opavshie list'ia, while hesitating to print and publish them.<sup>52</sup> In these pages that were genuinely not for publication within his lifetime, Rozanov describes his inner conflict in apocalyptic terms, as a demonic temptation:

Неутешный плач души о своем «Уед.».

Как мог я сам разрушить все. Сам. Сам. Сам. Никто еще.

Никто бы его и не смог одолеть. Но «одолел сам Розанов». Отлично. Т.е. для врагов. Для зла. Для дьявола.

Вот никогда не верил в него, а пришлось УВИДЕТЬ.

У, хвостатый. У, черт. И все же я плюю на тебя. Вечный. Противный. Боже.

<...>

Когда я думал: «одолею всю литературу», - это я думал именно об «Уед.» и «Оп. л.». И мог бы, если бы «Уед.» осталось ОДНО. Ведь я знал по письмам - хотя бы Горького, уж за что-то оно производило неизгладимое впечатление, с него «начали считать время». Тут хвостик дьявола: вздумал «помогать ему». Это как бы «апостолы начали писать примечания к своим посланиям»; или Христос начал «объяснять прощание Свое с учениками»: и иллюзия рассеялась. Все обратилось в картон и вату.

<...>

Иллюзия рассеялась. И «Уединенное» -

СЛОВА, СЛОВА И СЛОВА,  
а не одно нужное

СЛОВО.

А я писал

СЛОВО.

И оно же было написано. Сделано.

Разрушить было нельзя. <...> И вдруг я сам...  
отломывая по кусочку от памятника и стал ими кидаться в  
неприятных и общественных особ.

<...>

Ха-ха-ха-ха...

Смейся - черт. А я плачу. И все-таки я человек и  
больше тебя. Нет - сильнее тебя. Ибо я с Богом - у ног Его,  
а ты вдали «Противник Божий».<sup>53</sup>

Rozanov here repeats his faith in the original impulse for the writing of Uedinennoe. Yet Rozanov is led into a fatal temptation. The need to write continuously threatened the purity of the very role that he sought to play. He fears that he is unable 'simply to live', the immediate spontaneous life that he defends, and that he sought to restore to Russian society by the very writing of his books. He suspects that he is himself imbued with all the fatal flaws of 'literariness' that he understands so well and believes will lead to the downfall of life and culture in his country. He compares the continuation of his opavshie list'ia genre to the writing of footnotes to sacred words. It was these very footnotes and commentaries



that he was to describe as containing the deadening weight of scholarship that was crushing the life out of the man trapped under the bookshelf in Apokalipsis nashego vremeni.<sup>54</sup> It as though Rozanov himself realized that he was trapped, as inescapably as the man, by an inability to live without books. Rozanov fears that he is in danger of becoming a paradigm of the prolix 'empty-wordedness' (pustoslovie) that is anathema to him, and of being unable to write the sacred and prophetic 'Word' (SLOVO) for Russian literature.

In the unpublished Mimoletnoe of 1915, Rozanov questioned his own aims in publishing his opavshie list'ia genre:

А м.б., это и есть преступление - публиковать «Уед.» и «Оп. л.»?

Очень м. БЫТЬ.

Запутался мой ум. Не вижу. Не понимаю.

М. БЫТЬ, литература вообще преступление?

«Нет, отчего же: если есть талант написать поэму или повесть».

Сочинить. Выдумать. Талант воображения.

Но ведь это же забава? - соглашаюсь - забава таланта?

Да. А вы приняли литературу в самом деле. В этом и заключается преступление.<sup>55</sup>

Rozanov sees this use of writing as 'horrific' and yet he continues to revel in his uniqueness, in the power with

which his constant writing invests him, in his becoming a singular literary phenomenon. Rozanov's repeated associations of his role as a writer with that of a national martyr, saint, or even Christ-figure, his assertion of a constant spiritual activity to the point of exhaustion in the service of Russia, is his defence against accusations, and his own doubts, that there is something wrong, or even sinister, in his ultimate literariness. The roles that he chose suited the apocalyptic tone in which he presages the end of writing of which he hopes to be an agent.

..ни одной вялой строчки на таком неизмеримом протяжении всех трудов и с 1882 г. (кончил университет) - ни одной вялой, безжизненной, плетущейся строки.

Удивительно. Вполне удивительно горение. Сколько же было «запасено в мне дров», чтобы сложить такой чудовищный костер.<sup>56</sup>

Rozanov repeatedly uses images of firewood to describe the themes that he had brought to the attention of the national consciousness. The image of writing as burning implies a contradictory impulse to that of literature as permanent authority; the burning not the preservation of words. Rozanov described his own writing as being like a burning coal pulled out from the fire,<sup>57</sup> and frequently used images of explosions that burn and leave no trace to describe his ideal of the writer's task.<sup>58</sup> He wanted both to bring an

immense fuel of cultural and historical themes and to overcome them in a sacramental burning that would free him from the burden of past books and authorities. Thus he might truly represent the 'end of literature' and the phoenix-like emergence of spontaneous, book-free life. This activity took over his entire existence.

In Opavshie list'ia, Rozanov had described the terrible power of his compulsive literariness that supposedly sought to free human existence from its enslavement to books.<sup>59</sup> He wavered between the glorification of this ultimate literariness and a horror of its all-consuming power. He feared that he himself, more than anyone else, was fatally possessed by literature, and not free to live at all. These doubts are a continual part of Rozanov's attempts to determine the reasons for his writing. He feared that his self-transformation in literature was also a loss of life. The exultance in his own literary feat is undercut by a sadness and continual sense of longing for a life that literature cannot provide:

«Конец» и м. б. «смерть». Вот это «конец» и м.б. «смерть» литературы, литературности, я чувствую в себе. Я не даром говорил о глубокой скорби быть литератором, и когда «б. литератором» (с удачею) всех радует, - меня это <...> томит томлением до того ужасным, черным, что я не умею сравнить. При безумной жажде жизни, именно жизни, я ведь не живу и нисколько не жил, а только «писал». Но оставляя в стороне «самого» и возвращаясь к теме «великого писателя», я и

думаю, что вообще не рождалось еще человека, у которого сполна все его лицо перешло бы в «литературу», сполна все бытие улеглось бы в «литературу». Читатель видит, до чего это не есть «качество», а просто «есть».

<...> Моя же литература и даже (что-то брезжит в уме) литература вообще в своем рождении и существе есть «мой дом», в который я никогда не «приходил», но тут жил всегда и д. б. беспamięтно родился.<sup>60</sup>

In this passage Rozanov claims to have been born in literature and so to contain in himself the contradictions of its development and its death, as well as revealing its origins. He is the Alpha and Omega of literature, its apocalypse. He was seeking to end literary activity by making his writing convey the ultimate possibilities of expression: 'таким образом явно во мне есть какое-то завершение литературы; литературности; ее существа - как потребности отразить и выразить. Больше что же еще выражать? Паутины, вздохи, последнее уловимое.' [Q. 1. II: 333] Yet he also claimed to embody the original impulse of literature; thus he could not escape his own 'literariness'. Rozanov sought to further the apocalypse and revolution in Russian literature and unwittingly achieved his personal literary apocalypse. By making his entire life into a literary statement he had hoped to conquer literature, instead he found himself trapped in writing.

In a letter of 1918 to Gollerbakh, Rozanov described

his campaign in literature that produced his opavshie list'ia genre. He refers to Dostoevskii's battles. In his opavshie list'ia genre Rozanov had pushed the 'subjectivity' that he identified in Dostoevskii to its ultimate limits so that the world in which the apocalypse would take place became increasingly encapsulated in Rozanov's interior world:

Вы знаете, что мои «Уед.» и «Оп. л.» в значительной степени сформированы под намерением начать литературу с другого конца: вот с конца этого уединенного, уединения, «сердца» и «своей думки», без всякой соц.-демократической сволочи. Жажда освободиться от нее, духовно от нее выйти - доходила до судороги и сумасшествия. Гениальные «Записки из подполья» Достоевского есть почти бессильная борьба с «соц.-дем. сволочью». <sup>61</sup>

The intimacy and solitude that Rozanov defended in his writing threatened to become Rozanov's only world. Rozanov cannot escape the close involvement with the things around him that denies an objective distancing:

Мир, который я узнаю, слушаю, вижу, - который так люблю и восторгаюсь им - он «мой мир». И поистине Розанов из «Розанова» никак не может выскочить, ни - разрушить «Розанова».

Что и есть мое «уединение». Т. е. такое слишком близкое отношение всех вещей ко мне. <sup>62</sup>

Rozanov reaches a position where he sees all knowledge as centred in the individual. He denies the objective existence of 'facts' independent of himself: 'Где «мое» кончается - кончается история. Нельзя ничего понять не «мое».'<sup>63</sup> Under the pressure of external circumstance this solitary 'subjectivity' threatened to develop into an increasingly solipsistic self-referential world, despite moments of startling insight into external events. Losev has argued that Rozanov's need to stake out an original and 'subjective' viewpoint hindered his true genius which was in his perception of the very external facts that he claimed not to notice;<sup>64</sup> however, Rozanov maintained that his 'subjectivity' was the very source of his insight.

In the unpublished Mimoletnoe Rozanov's self-depiction became increasingly fantastical. Images rooted in the city and contemporary civilization are replaced by a florid imagery of a fecund and pantheistic world. The description of himself as a Christ-like figure gives way to that of a pagan God, giving succour to all:

...о дойная корова. <...> Идешь и молоко сочится из вымени... И оно такое красивое, белое, розовое, огромное. И такие чудные четыре соска. Розовые. «Прямо пососал бы». Это - я. Т. е. у себя пососал бы. <...>.

Страшно люблю, когда у меня молоко течет.

И капает на травы, на растения. «Вся роза в молоке» - Васька прошел. «И вся крапива в молоке» - Васька прошел. И нет жгучести, злобы. Розанов умирающее начало мира. «Все

ИДИТЕ И СОСИТЕ МОИ ТИТЬКИ».

<...>

И хочется всех насытить. Я хотел бы, чтобы все телята кормились от меня. И в лучшую минуту я думаю, что мог бы насытить всех быков мира.

Вот я.

Розанов.<sup>65</sup>

Critics have seen this as a fatal hypertrophy of Rozanov's subjective freedom. Nosov argues that Rozanov's artistic freedom took over his life, and resulted in the loss of his true independence: 'Творческий путь Розанова - нескончаемая ваханалия свободы, оргиастическое наваждение, в которое в конце концов утонула его душа, его личность.'<sup>66</sup> Sukach also describes a crisis in Rozanov's relationship to the outside world: 'Двуликость, расщепленность сознания и усиленная рефлексия привели Розанова к глубокой жизненной драме, которую он стал осмыслить только на исходе своих дней. Драма эта заключалась во все большей и большей потере чувства действительности и, как следствие, в фатальной обреченности на неучастие в ней.'<sup>67</sup>

But Rozanov's non-participation was not simply a matter of personal choice. His own principled self-contradiction in literature had destructive consequences. He was increasingly ostracized by his contemporaries for articles that were deliberately provocative in their voicing of right-wing and anti-semitic opinions. A succession of events, including his estrangement from the

Merezhkovskiis, his exclusion from the liberal journal Russkoe slovo in 1911 and the Religious and Philosophical Society in 1913, combined to make Rozanov an increasingly isolated figure. He claimed to despise these manoeuvres, but made enough reference to them in his writing for it to be clear that the ostracism hurt. In 1911 and 1912-13 he had found a refuge for his need for uncompromising self-expression in the writing of Uedinennoe and Opavshie list'ia. Yet this itself became a literary trap. Readers of the second book of Opavshie list'ia accused Rozanov of 'forcing' an artistic pose rather than genuine self-revelation. From 1913, both in subsequent opavshie list'ia (Sakharna and Mimoletnoe), and in footnotes to the publication of Literaturnye izgnanniki, Rozanov returned more and more insistently to the analysis of his own literary phenomenon. The defiant individualism and hyberbolic self-invention of the unpublished Mimoletnoe of 1915 are perhaps the most desperate document of Rozanov's bid to justify his writing and transcend his self-imposed contradictions.

The revolution seemed at first to offer Rozanov an opportunity to break out of this isolation. Apokalipsis nashego vremeni, perhaps the ultimate statement of contemporary life as apocalypse, was distributed as pamphlets and Rozanov was once more in direct contact with his readers. He believed that this work could have a transforming apocalyptic effect, as he wrote in an exultant letter to Izmailov in 1918:



Действительно, действительно времена Апок-са. Они пришли, они - вот... Господи! Ну, все это я разжую. <...> Уже с 8-9 вып. появится прямо страшное чтение и у меня <...> «Апок.» должен бы печататься как в эпоху Реформации и Ульриха фон-Гуттена 500.000 экземпляров - и тогда он должен бы и он смог бы, сможет религ. переворот (потому что сказать «церковный» это МАЛО).<sup>68</sup>

The style of this letter is characteristic of Rozanov's late letters in its exclamatory, over-excited tone, at times approaching hysteria. In the letter he also reaffirms his instructions that all his anti-Jewish writings should be destroyed, describing the 'apocalyptic' transformation of his views: 'в виду целого апокалиптич. переворота прежде всего совершающегося-то в моей душе.'<sup>69</sup> Rozanov asks Izmailov to publish his letter immediately in two different newspapers. He claims that the letter has an historic importance, emphasizing his own revolutionary role: 'Это письмо, я верю, историческое. Его сказало небо. С него начинается реформация. Ты, Сама - Ульрих фон Гуттен, я - Лютер.'<sup>70</sup> Although Rozanov's tone was still extreme, the short lived publication of Apokalipsis nashego vremeni saved him, for a time, from his own divisions.

CHAPTER VIII: ROZANOV, WRITING AND RELIGIOUS BELIEF

Rozanov's opavshie list'ia are marked by a continual appeal to God. At the moments of deepest doubt on the nature and justification for his writing, Rozanov has recourse to God as a higher author and guarantor of his utterance. He is a source of authority beyond the immediate reader. He justifies Rozanov in his endless need for speech when he is most doubting of its value or purpose as written literature for an audience. Yet Rozanov has been seen as a thinker in a crisis of belief. Losev believed that Rozanov's writing could be explained only by a profound inability to believe in anything but his own sensations: 'Розанов - человек, который все понимает и ни во что не верит.'<sup>1</sup> Losev's intimations of Rozanov's lack of belief are important. Rozanov, whose work is seemingly immersed in religion, for whom writing was like prayer, who made persistent addresses to God and claimed that God was as close to him as any human, is perhaps more important in showing the strength and variety of man's need for God rather than as a convincing proof of God's real presence.

Shestov noted the subtlety of Rozanov's religious position. He wrote of Rozanov's love for God despite his lack of faith:

Розанов любил Бога, Розанов искал Бога, но того горчичного зерна веры, за которое людям обетовано божеством «не будет для вас ничего невозможного», он в себе не находил и

правдиво об этом рассказал. И правдивый рассказ об умершем Боге больше даст людям, чем притворное исповедование ничего не говорящих душе истин.<sup>2</sup>

Prishvin notes in his diaries Rozanov's daughter's statement that her father did not believe in God but rather in his own 'discovery'. On their second meeting she affirms that he was religious.<sup>3</sup> This swing of views is quite representative of the prevarication in Rozanov's own view.

Other contemporaries interpreted Rozanov's writing as a Nietzschean battle against God, or the work of an Antichrist who wanted to put himself on an equal footing with God. Yet it is perhaps truer, and more interesting, to see in Rozanov, as Shestov did, an emotive impulse towards survival in a world that has lost its immediate sense of the sacred. What is striking is Rozanov's amazement and reverence before a man who prays, even before an empty sky:

Если бы даже кто не любил Бога, как не полюбить эту любовь к Богу? Чудное дело - религия; как-то умеет же человек самое насущное свое - боли, страдания, горести, поименные, ежедневные, - связать с самым далеким, неосязаемым, вездесущим. <...> И свят же человек молящийся... Если бы даже «там», в небесах, и было пусто, как непременно хотят скептики, то все равно слезы человечества уже сами по себе суть религия и вызывают к себе религиозное умиление...<sup>4</sup>

<...> религиозное-же чувство просто есть, вероятно врождено

как зрение и обоняние. «Помолиться хочется», «люблю когда молится человек» (зрелище), «хорошо когда мы все молимся» (общность, универсальность) - это просто мое «хочу» и не связано ни с какой идеей. Мне даже кажется, что атеист по отчетливому исповедованию <...> может быть все равно религиозным человеком. Религиозного человека я узнаю, когда он рассказывает, как он купил вещь на базаре; религиозного человека я узнаю, с 1 1/2 страницы книги, где-нибудь из середины, все равно. Религиозность есть «стиль человека», стиль построения его души, а в зависимости от этого - построения всей его жизни, деятельности, поступков, - и она сказывается во всякой мелочи, не отвязывается от человека ни в чем и никогда.<sup>5</sup>

Rozanov loved man's capacity for religion more than God. His continual summons to God in his writing is more revealing of his fear of God's absence, than of an overwhelming sense of divine presence. His writing can be understood as a struggle to understand his need for God and his fear of living life without anything sacred. He lived at a transitional time in Russian history, where the speed with which systems of value were discredited was suddenly rapid. The rapidity with which people exchanged entire faiths, materialist and idealist, must have undermined the most resolute faith in received truths, particularly for one who was so acute to the abuse of words and concepts by personal manipulations and self-deceit. Rozanov lamented the loss of a spontaneous sacred sense in everyday life.

His nostalgia for, and interest in, past civilizations, as well as his moments of apocalyptic utopianism and longing for a new Golden Age were attempts to make good this loss, to restore man's sense of a sacred connection to the world of the everyday in which he was living.

Rozanov's writing, supposedly so modern, is a defence against modernity, as well as a demonstration of his bewilderment at that modernity. The painstaking acuity with which Rozanov recorded every movement of thought, although it contained elements of pose, is perhaps less self-indulgent than it at first seems. For in his self-contradiction and prevarication ('vseshtataemost'), his sense that the only truth could be found in his own movements of thought and belief, he shows us not the defence of a constructed system but the deliberations of an individual hesitating on the brink of affirmation. He shows us the movement of will in its attempt to believe. Writing in some way makes good the shortcomings of faith.

A letter to Pertsov written in 1900 is revealing about a turning point in Rozanov's writing career. It expresses a point of existential as well as literary doubt, a crisis in self-confidence. In this letter Rozanov questions the various directions of his writing and reveals the concerns that were the underlying causes of his future work. Yet the letter is also rich in the accidie and boredom of someone who has lost a sense of joy and energy, which were vital to Rozanov's sense of the sacred everyday. The tone is unusually bleak, Rozanov expresses doubts in God, and in

man:

Скверное наше время, т.е. скверно наше бессилие. <...>  
К чему мы способны? Умереть. Ну, это [всем] придет смерть  
и она умрет, не выписывая мудрости из-за границы.

<...> Вообще у меня на душе ужасное томление. Чувство  
утомленного пловца. Чувство, когда корабль утонул - и не  
знаешь, что делать, и даже не понимаешь стран горизонта.  
Скучно и сиротливо.

<...>  
«Умрем - похоронят...» Базаровский «лопух». Представьте,  
что мне специально отвратительно как писателю: слава.  
Отсюда высунул бы язык всем «проводящим гроб». Ничего нет  
скучнее и притворнее. «Скоро ли до могилы, а то калоши все  
в грязи, да и чаю хочется». В сущности каждому чай дороже  
человека. Да верно того и стоит человек.

Милое-интимное. А интимного все меньше у человека и в  
жизни.

Кому нужен мой «брак». Никому кроме меня. И с чего я  
стараюсь? Вид индивидуального сумасшествия. «У каждого свой  
конек», и этого конька люди называют талантом, а на небесах  
как его называют? Да и есть ли небеса? Да и нужны ли? Ох,  
как хотелось бы, а не знаю.

Ничего не знаю.<sup>6</sup>

Rozanov asserted that disbelief in, or indifference  
towards, an afterlife was in no way a negation of religious  
belief. As he wrote in a footnote to his contribution to a

collection of articles on 'Death', published in 1910:

По-видимому Д-р Якобий удивляется, что во мне разделены, не связаны идеи загробного существования, которое я отвергаю или к которому равнодушен, и религиозное чувство, которое налично во мне есть. Но ведь загробное существование - это именно «идея», «концепция», и, как такова, строится или возникает <...>. <...> но бессмертие, загробный мир? Это идея и искусственность, это - не так обще, важно, необходимо, истинно и питательно, это уже далеко не так есть, как религия.'

Rozanov's bid at eternity had to be made in this world. His sense of the transience of this world was sharpened by a firm conviction that this is the only world. He could not imagine an afterlife, but this does not contradict his religious sense. This is perhaps the essential characteristic of Rozanov's sense of the sacred and the source of its strength. Religion is found in what is evident, the immediate surroundings, and not in a distant spiritual world. Man had to break with the illusion of a future redemption, and redeem himself immediately, so that he was free to live, and to concentrate on what is most valuable and most fleeting. Life in the here and now had to be made eternal in its immediacy, through writing. Rozanov's writing was a constant assertion of his love for this world because, although full of suffering, it was the only world. Rozanov had a horror of death which he believed

was final, absolute. Mochul'skii recognized this as a source of Rozanov's constant need to write: 'Его манера все мысли «выговаривать» и все движения записывать - не эгоцентризм и самовлюбленность, а непрестанная борьба со смертью.'<sup>8</sup> Rozanov continued this battle until his own last weeks of life, dictating the physical process of his own death to his daughter, who transcribed his words, so that this final living experience could also become a part of the last opavshie list'ia.<sup>9</sup>

This belief in the finality of death became the central motivation of Rozanov's opavshie list'ia genre. These writings continued many of the doubts expressed above concerning literary fame, doubt of God and doubt of salvation. Yet they were also a bid to assert the value of this world. As Rozanov continually asserted in his opavshie list'ia, real life was most sacred of all. It was the reason for his writing:

Самое существенное - просто действительность.

(за уборкой книг и в мысли, почему

я издал «Уед.»)

[O. 1. I: 285]

Rozanov argued that real life was the source of all true culture and should be treated with as much reverence as metaphysical speculation, indeed it was an inseparable part of metaphysics. He feared the loss of a sense of life's immediate and immense power would lead to the destruction



of real life. He wrote to Blok in 1909 that the sustaining of a true culture depended on this careful attention to the immediate reality that surrounds us: 'Вообще жизнь ужасно бедна настоящим, и настоящая культура и начатки культуры и состоит в страшно бережном отношении ко всему настоящему.'<sup>10</sup>

Rozanov sought to overcome his fear of an impending non-existence by the reassertion of his connection to the world of things, through writing. His opavshie list'ia genre was his attempt to restore man's relation to his immediate reality, to awaken him to the thoughts that occur in response to unknown people he crosses in the street, the sound of the ventilator, or the words of his children. Only this world is given justification, and eternity, as Rozanov sees it, in words. By fixing the passing instants in words, he believes he has in some way redeemed a loss. Rozanov criticized the fragmentation of contemporary life. The structure of his books were not an attempt at a mimesis of modernity, but a bid to rescue moments of reflection and concentration from the chaos of impressions. Rozanov could not accept that things must simply cease to exist. He would only accept an afterlife if it contained all the tiny details and material 'things', the clutter of this world. Thus he wondered if you could hear the ventilator 'there', in the other world, and claimed that he would go to heaven only together with his handkerchief, and would accept heaven on no other terms.

In Opavshie list'ia Rozanov gives a detailed

description of the process of his thought as it reaches out to make contact with the world of things, and the subjective reasons for this need to make contact:

Я никогда не догадывался, не искал, не подглядывал, не соображал. <...>

Но меня вдруг поражало что-нибудь. Мысль или предмет. Или: «вот так-бы (оттуда-бы) бросит свет». <...>

В отношении к предметам, мыслям и «оттуда-то» у меня была зачарованность. <...>

В сущности, я ни в чем не изменился с Костромы (лет 13). То же равнодушие к «хорошо» и «дурно». Те же поступки по мотиву «любопытно» и «хочется». Та же, пожалуй, холодность или скорее безучастие к окружающему. Та же почти постоянная грусть, откуда-то текущая печаль, которая только ищет «зацепки» или «повода», чтобы перейти в страшную внутреннюю боль, до слез... Та же нежность, только ищущая зацепки.

Основное пожалуй мое отношение к миру есть нежность и грусть.

Откуда она и в чем, собственно, она состоит?

Мне печально, что все несовершенно <...> что самым вещам как-то нехорошо, они не удовлетворены, им больно. Что вещам «больно», это есть постоянное мое страдание за всю жизнь. Через это «больно» проходит нежность. Вещи мне кажутся какими-то обиженными, какими-то сиротами, кто-то их

мало любит, кто-то их мало ценит. «Неженья» же все вещи в высшей степени заслуживают, и мне решительно ни одна вещь в мире не казалась дурною. Я бы ко всем дотрагивалась, всем проводил бы «по шерстке» <...>. Мне иногда кажется, что я вечно бы с людьми «воровал у Бога»... не то золотые яблоки, не то счастье, вот это убавление грусти, вот это убавление боли, вот эту ужасную смертность и «окончателность людей», что все «кончается» и все не «вечно».

[O. l. I: 263-64]

In this way Rozanov tried to overcome his own schism between writing and life. Writing was a way to break through an immobilizing sense of incompleteness, both his own and the world's. Things seem unfulfilled until Rozanov has conferred power on them in words. It is through his telling, through their inclusion in his subjective world, that they participate in the divine plan as designated by Rozanov. The centre of this world is his own perception and all things participate in this world as he reaches out towards them in words. Rozanov sees his own writing as a sacred act conferring an eternal voice and existence on incomplete existence through the word. The process ensures a guarantee of the sacredness both of his own words and of his world. The attempt to preserve the sacredness of his own writing was particularly important for Rozanov, who felt the dangers to his integrity, and the dangers with which words were fraught, acutely. The relation of words to things was the only honest religious stance for Rozanov.

Rozanov claimed that a writer had a duty towards things as much as towards words and purely stylistic achievements:

Мастерство писательства состоит не в одном даре письма, слова; хотя оно необходимо - но этот дар письма является только заключительным звеном цепи других, более внутренних и драгоценных, даров. Сущность писательской души заключается в гораздо большем, чем у обыкновенных людей, даре вникать в вещи и любить вещи, видеть их и враздробь, и в обобщении, в связи, в панораме.

<...> И все это отражается не только в «построенных» произведениях (литература при жизни), но не может не отразиться и в каждой записочке.<sup>11</sup>

Despite his protestations against the terrible and artificial aspects of 'literariness', Rozanov's work is underlain by a complicated faith in the relationship between the world, existence and writing. The living existence that he celebrated against the suffocations of literature could only be made felt through writing. Rozanov's own writing was an attempt to fix in words his fleeting relationship with the outside world that he felt to be so sharply transient, and so to doubly renew his attachment to it. He sought to make his own 'literature' as close as possible to the notes that he describes above as being just as expressive as constructed literary works of the writer's feeling for things. The love for things should include the very shadows of these existences, which was for

Rozanov as important as the thing itself:

Вы любите не только предметы, но и тени предметов.

Так и в любви.

Любите не только любовь, но и тени любви.<sup>12</sup>

Rozanov believed that literature and the press had betrayed this duty of writing. Words dominated life but they no longer enlivened it. The words themselves had lost the 'shades' and 'details' that were for Rozanov the vital aspect of all things and existences:

Сколько слов и как мало мыслей.

Всюду. В разговорах. В печати.

<...>

Душа человеческая распалась на слова. А мысли? - «не можем».

Самые слова теперь потеряли одушевление, протяженность. Слова стали без теней, без «подробностей».

Ужасно.

Угасло уважение ко всем вещам.<sup>13</sup>

Rozanov claimed that the hidden life of things was sacred. Things were more valuable for him in their 'shady' existence than in their clear outlines:

«Бог в тайне»: иначе Его нельзя. Не наблюдали ли вы, что во всем мире разлита эта нежная и глубокая застенчивость,

стыдливость, утаивание себя, - что уходит, как в средоточие их всех, в «неизреченные тайны Божия» и, наконец, в существо «Неисповедимого Лица»? От этого все глубокие вещи мира не выпячиваются, а затеваются, куда-то уходят от глаза, не указывают на себя, не говорят о себе. <...> Мне прямо не хотелось бы жить в таком плоском мире, где вещи были бы лишены этой главной прелести своей, что они не хотят быть видимы, что они вечно уходят, скрываются.<sup>14</sup>

The silent, unspoken existences of things is of immense importance for Rozanov, in contrast to the loud and empty words of literary ambition. Rozanov claimed that his obligation to things was to 'give voice' to silent existences, not in the noisy declarations of print, but in the private note form of the opavshie list'ia genre. This attention to the 'orphan'-like lives of things included the life of his family to whom he gave voice and eternity in his writing. He claimed that his writing was an attempt to recognize, in words, all the silent influences of his life. Rozanov's family was the basis of his fusion of his own life with literature, that he saw as his unique literary phenomenon:<sup>15</sup>

- Эти люди <...> все мне отдали, от всего в мире отреклись, чтобы мне было хорошо, уютно, не горестно, спокойно, наконец, сносно. И никто их труда и жизни не видит, не видит бездны работы и самоотречения. И никогда об этом не будет рассказано. Это - в мгле. В мировой мгле. Они

не литературные, не ученые и «без голоса, без языка» (закричать, сказать). <...> Так что же такое я: то явное «в свете», что около них живет? (литератор, говорю). Да они, может быть, есть самое светлое, что я в своей жизни увидал, узнал. Они родили все мои идеалы, родили «Сумерки просвещения», родили «Легенду о Великом Инквизиторе», «Место христианства в истории». Я, собственно, только «перерабатывал» в слова (п[отому] ч[то] мне был дан дар слова) то, что видел и что подмечал мой внимательный взгляд. Не у Дягилева же, не у Берга, не у Александрова, не у Сытина я брал идеи: а из - кухни, детской и спальни. Вот «Сад Божий», где я «научился всему». <...> случайно и неисповедимо «в кухне и спальне», в трудах и заботах, в болезнях и страданиях - я в самом деле увидел объективно и бесстрастно «лучшее», чем собрания, лекции, книги...<sup>16</sup>

Sukach describes Rozanov's need to give voice to voiceless existences as a bid for eternity: 'Один из основных мотивов писательства Розанова - это его «порыв в бессмертие». Глубоко связанный со своей семьей, Розанов страдал из-за их (детей и жены) «безгласности» и «безъязыковости». У него даже укоренилась некая потребность увековечить их «затаенное существование».'<sup>17</sup>

Rozanov claimed that he had brought private and 'shady' existences into the public sphere of the book, in the belief that this would in some way redeem the book:

...между многими мотивами, почему я пишу

«Уед[инненное]» (и последующее), есть этот:

Великое спасибо миру.

Нет - личнее, ближе и горячее: не оставить не рассказанным, не выраженным, не «поцелованным» и сверх внутреннего тайного поцелуя и явно-то, самое прекрасное, самое милое, на чем я рос и воспитался, что мне в жизни помогало, что меня в жизни благословляло. Мне было бы страшно умереть, я не счел бы себя благородным, если бы это все осталось глухо, где-то в тени. О, я хорошо знаю, слишком хорошо, что «затененные существования» суть самые счастливые и благородные, и чистые; но «все-таки»... Может быть, наша внешняя жизнь, каковою невольно не может не быть жизнь всякого писателя, согрется и надушится благородными «лесными маргаритками», если мы не будем так очень отделяться от частной жизни... Что все, обыкновенно, так наглухо заперто от книги...

Я решил немного улучшить книгу, вообще книгу, приотворив щелку двери. Мне все-таки страшно жалко книг; вообще книг; хотя я с ними и вражду. Но эта вражда поистине «сквозь кровь и слезы».

И книгу я решил переложить «маргаритками».<sup>18</sup>

Only this value of the moment, this charged attention to the momentary detail, is a bid against death and temporality. Rozanov's relation to the things of this world is so important to his writing that he records his gradual sense of approaching death as a distancing from things. He describes his anxiety in the face of this loss of



connection, which was the mainstay of his writing and thus of his life. He realized that the loss of this connection would mean the end of writing and so death:

Не вещи от меня отходят, а я от вещей отхожу.

Я и не заметил. Вещи такие же, живые, нужные.

Но уже не нужные мне, которому вообще скоро ничто не станет нужно...

Ни жена...

Ни дети...

Кроме «аршина в ширину» и «сажени в длину». Последняя постель больного...

Ужасно.<sup>19</sup>

Khovin described Rozanov's affirmation of things and details as a groundbreaking outlet for spiritual emotion, freeing man from the false claims on eternity of abstractions: 'До сих пор духовная жизнь без отвлеченностей и эмпирей решительно немислима была.'<sup>20</sup> Rozanov claimed that his writing made the momentary detail eternal. The opavshie list'ia genre was an attempt to hold perceptions that are described as 'eternal' amidst the fragmentary, transient, everyday incidences. His work is making a bid against death and the relentless progression of time, yet it recognizes this very continuous temporal motion as a principle of the work. The titles of three of the central books in this genre, Smertnoe, Opavshie list'ia, and Mimoletnoe, bear witness to this sense of transience.

Мысли наши, как трава, вырастают и умирают. Но радости и печали суть какие-то отлагания в Склад Вечности.

Эти отлагания я и записываю в «Уед.».<sup>21</sup>

Это («листки») есть в сущности всеобщая и вечная литература «всех нас». Но никому не приходит на ум напечатать.<sup>22</sup>

Rozanov is trying to find a way to free the new ideas that each man contains, by releasing him from the pre-conceived views with which literature and journalism have subdued him. He wanted to stir people into the depths of their own lives before they passed them by, diverted by illusory slogans and goals that have been given a false sacredness through print. The best response for a reader is for him to begin reading his own life. He should 'read' the book of his life in order to focus on his unique collision of circumstance. He should learn not to seek one fixed view, but to live with passion the 'themes' of his life. Rozanov saw his writing as a spur to readers to lead them away from pure literary engagement to thinking about life:

Я жив: и кто хочет «учиться» у меня (читатели) - слушайте всего меня, ни на чем не останавливаясь, даже (особенно талантливые читатели) не останавливаясь и на «сумме», а от меня «боком» заражаясь тем волнением и жизнью, какой я горю вот много лет и не уставая: и ты проживешь жизнь (над другими темами) так же счастливо и грустно, плодотворно и опять грустно - до отчаяния, до могилы, «как бы до смерти»

и опять переходя в озарения, до не хочу более, довольно»!.<sup>23</sup>

Собственно, есть одна книга, которую человек обязан внимательно прочитать, - это книга его собственной жизни. И, собственно, есть одна книга, которая для него по-настоящему поучительна, - это книга его личной жизни.

Она одна ему открыта вполне, и - ему одному. Собственно, это и есть то новое, совершенно новое в мире, ни на что чужое не похожее, что он может прочитать, узнать. Его личная жизнь - единственный новый факт, который он с собой приносит на землю.

<...>

Поэтому «Уедин.» собственно, каждый человек обязан о себе написать. Это есть единственное наследие, какое он оставляет миру и какое миру от него можно получить, и мир вправе его получить. «Все прочее не существенно», - и все прочее, что он мог написать или сказать, лишь частью верно; «верное» там не в его власти, не в его знаниях.<sup>24</sup>

The 'one book', the sacred book, was for Rozanov, this act of faith in relation to one's own life that delivers utterance. The writer of his life opens himself up to the existence around him and his word is like prayer. Rozanov believes that everyone should be writing their own Opavshie list'ia. This responsibility to one's own experience and the need to answer to it in words is close to the Russian sense of philosophy that is immanent to the individual life. The process of self-uncovery was an endless

potential, yet man could only grow if he was open and responsive to these seeds of growth, the 'inner characters' with which he is inscribed. Each man's word is unique, by listening to his voice we gain access to his irrepeatable existence. For Rozanov the stifling prolixity of depersonalized voices in print had overwhelmed this intimate attention to human voices. Thus the last 'leaf' of Opavshie list'ia:

Все глуше голоса земли...

И - не надо.

Только один слабый, надтреснутый голосок всегда будет смешиваться с моими слезами.

И когда и он умолкнет для меня, я хочу быть слепым и глухим в себе самом, an und fur sich.

(поздно ночью и на даче и всегда)

[O. I. I: 330]

Rozanov's opavshie list'ia genre, supremely innovatory and modernist, was a reaction to the failings of modernity in the private lives and culture of individuals. It is also an affirmation of Rozanov's own spirit, that, as Mandel'shtam noted, was continually seeking to feel out the walls of a true culture.<sup>25</sup> Writing down was Rozanov's act of faith. His amazement before the chance and passing configurations of things, moods, and his own thought was more powerful for him than any Orthodox belief. Rozanov was

perhaps unable to believe in God, but his writing became a way of speaking about the impossibility of life without belief, of the need to celebrate and recognize the power of his life and the world in which it was lived in the belief that these moments are the most important, and should not be lost or left unspoken and unrecorded. Despite all his disclaiming, Rozanov had an immense faith in writing. It was the only religious stance possible for him.

An attempt to define Uedinennoe in the unpublished Mimoletnoe of 1914 is revealing of the relation between Rozanov's need for writing and his need for God:

- «Уединенное»?

Это плач писателя о своем писательстве.

*(в трамвае, не попав на поезд)*

Может быть, и отказ безбожника от своего безбожия.

Нет.

Я ведь маленький и грустный. Разве такие бывают безбожниками?

Господи! Я никогда не уходил от Тебя.

*(назад в трамвае)*

*(теснятся на площадке)<sup>26</sup>*

The passage is a statement of a writer's inability to live without writing, and a lament at his enslavement to a profession that he saw as deeply flawed. It also implies that it is only through writing that Rozanov can stave off

the impending sense of God's absence. The passage ends with a familiar reassertion of Rozanov's smallness, vulnerability, and therefore connection to God, yet the sense of Rozanov's constant need for writing to overcome his sense of lack is persuasive. Rozanov feared his own Godlessness as he feared his own loss of connection to life. Sensing God's lack, Rozanov attempts to renew his connection to God through writing, which is why his assertions of the sacred nature of his writing, and his sense of completion in God are so constant.

Rozanov reveals more about the difficulty of living without belief in the face of death and isolation than about the workings of God or religion. He is often called a mystic. Yet we do not learn from Rozanov, as we can in the writings of medieval religious writers such as Anselm or St Bernard, about the movements of soul as it gives itself up to religious possession. It is rather Rozanov who possesses God, and observes his own need for, or rebellion against Him. Rozanov's attitude to God is angry, doubting, rebellious, affectionate, but above all human and not held in reverence or awe by a presence that he describes as being as near to him as a guest in his house 'on the other side of the wall', 'a friend, as real as my children'.<sup>27</sup> He refers to Him by his first initial ('E.'), a sign of intimacy, just as he names his family and intimates.

Writing, as Remizov noted, was a form of prayer for Rozanov, 'А писать и молиться одно и то же <...> Розанов это понял.'<sup>28</sup> It was, as Rozanov himself declared, the

refusal of a Godless man to accept his own Godlessness, and the refusal of a non-believer to accept death. In his opavshie list'ia genre, Rozanov created for himself a form of expression as continuous and physical as the prayers of the Hesychasts, but one that gave him absolute license. It was an extremely modern form of prayer for the particular complexities of contemporary thoughts, anxieties and needs, in the absence of other receptive forms. Rozanov's innovation in writing was produced from the restlessness of a man who cannot bear the absence of God and the fact of death's finality rather than from an affirmation of faith. Yet it was an affirmation of a constant curiosity or delight in instants of transient life, and a joy in the words that fix them and somehow redeem the sense of endless loss. Rozanov's 'ear', that he speaks of, the rhythm and pauses of his thought, seek to overcome the anxiety of passing time in a world where God is not evident, while consciousness is alert and perhaps more acutely 'spiritual' in its complexity than in earlier, supposedly more religious times. This new form of writing was a freedom and revelation for readers and writers who had been restricted to the dominant forms of nineteenth century literature. Rozanov's spiritual and emotional needs, which may have been motivated by doubt just as much as by faith, produced a modernist literary form that opened up possibilities for writers who could not accept the fixed faiths of their society, and who were living, like Rozanov, in a time that had lost its confidence.

### CONCLUSION

Rozanov saw his own writing as a religious task, and I believe that it sprung from needs and impulses that can be understood as religious, in the broadest sense. Rozanov's writing, like that of Bakhtin and Mandel'shtam, is marked by an acute awareness of the importance of the word. All three writers, so distinct in their style and approach, are concerned with the tangible presence and situatedness of words, the relation of words to life, and man's religious instinct. Mandel'shtam and Bakhtin do not speak directly about their personal faith, but like Rozanov, are more interested in man's capacity for faith, and the variety of his religious expression. All three writers are tangential to Orthodox traditions of the word, and yet they are immensely important for the meeting of this tradition with more literary activity. In his search for a written expression adequate to his beliefs, Rozanov exemplifies many of the values upheld by Bakhtin and Mandel'shtam in their essays on writing and the word: above all the situatedness of utterance in immediate physical experience, the sense of byt'iistvennost' of words, the value for the historical role of language in culture, and the disclaiming of an immediate interlocutor.

The lasting power of Rozanov's writing lies in this concentration on the immediate experience. For Rozanov, the thought that is written down is inseparable from the things that surround man as he thinks, the physical presence of



his desk and writing objects, the changing light through the blind, the noise of his childrens' voices in the next room; this sharply felt transience is what Rozanov makes his eternity. By writing down and publishing this transience Rozanov addresses the gap between the constant loss of physical life and the illusory permanence of literature. At his most candid, Rozanov recognized that writing was as much a compensation for the shortcomings of belief as a driven assertion of that faith. He makes his life a constant record of his fear of losing the world; hoping for God, but only as a guarantee of the continuation of this immediate and tangible life. I think that this is the most lasting effect of his writing as religious thought.

Yet the impulse that generated Rozanov's prolific output cannot be separated from his writing style, which has proved highly influential. Rozanov's style has penetrated, whether or not consciously, to much of the writing about him. Memoirs and criticism are almost universally marked by extensive quotation of the writer; it is very hard to give a sense of Rozanov's work without using his own words. Rozanov's infectious 'voice' has been highly influential in Russian writing. Rozanov's phrases and tones of speech influenced later Russian writers, notably Siniavskii and Venedikt Erofeev, as noted in the introduction. Rozanovian resonances continue to make themselves felt in contemporary Russian literature; for example, the first Russian Booker prize winner, Mark

Kharitonov, won with a story about a man who collected random thoughts scribbled down on sweet papers in a suitcase, a new development of the 'box' of fallen leaves; (Mark Kharitonov, Linii sud'by, ili Sunduchok Milashevicha, Izbrannaia proza, 2 vols, Moscow, 1994, I, pp. 17-382).

This lasting influence of Rozanov's writing is more than purely formal, and affects our whole perception of literature and its relation to experience. Rozanov was preoccupied by the contradiction between spontaneous life and life saturated in and constantly becoming literature. Yet perhaps the power of his work is to make us aware of the paradox and even of the illusory nature of the opposition. The opavshie list'ia genre is an intricate product of a literary mind and consummate reader, yet it is also a reaction to events that happen in life, and to Rozanov's own needs and instincts. It would be a falsification to attribute all the cries and appeals in these writings purely to literary contrivance. The Uedinennoe and later opavshie list'ia genre, some of which was never intended for publication, was the product of need and conflict. There was a need, not unique to Rozanov, to speak and write with a greater freedom than that conventionally permitted in literature, as well as a sense of the futility of the traditional apparatus of literary invention. Rozanov's response to this need was extremely important for his contemporaries and for later generations.

Rozanov's exhortation to readers, in Pered Sakharnoi, to read the book of their own lives and to write their own

Uedinennoe, as witness to their own thoughts, experience and 'inner letters' seems a genuine conviction rather than device. Of course to speak of what is 'true' and 'genuine' in Rozanov's writing, or indeed in anyone's writing, runs the risk of falling into the very traps that Rozanov himself so cleverly exposes. Yet there are recurring themes in Rozanov's work that show a constant and involuntary preoccupation with the theme of writing and reading as both freedom and enslavement, and a need to stake out a true relationship with the word, that Rozanov knew to be changeable, tyrannical and fraught with deceit, not least the constant danger of self-deception. Many writers consider themselves to be speaking the truth when their words belie them, the difference with Rozanov is that he claimed not to care. Yet this claim itself is part of the testing out of the boundaries of truth and invention, a testing of the self and of the impulse for constant utterance. Although Rozanov does not succeed in freeing his reader from literature, he nevertheless greatly broadens the scope of his reader's reception of and response to what he reads, both within and without the 'official' canons of literature, and perhaps allows the man trapped under the bookcase in Apokalipsis nashego vremeni to breathe a little more freely.

# NOTES

## NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1. See the essay by Stanislav Dzhimbinov, 'The Return of Russian Philosophy', in Russian Thought After Communism. The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage, ed. James P. Scanlan, Armonk, New York, 1994, pp. 11-22, first published in Russian in 1992 ('Vozvrashchenie russkoi filosofii', Zdes' i teper', 1992, 1, pp. 76-84). For an extensive survey of Russian religious and philosophical publications and republications between 1988 and 1991, see Robin Aizlewood, 'The Return of the "Russian Idea" in Publications, 1988-91', Slavonic and East European Review, 71, 1993, pp. 490-99.

2. V. A. Fateev, 'Publitsist s dushoi metafizika i mistika', introductory article to V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 5-36(33).

3. Aleksei Remizov, Kuksha. Rozanovy pis'ma, Berlin, 1923, and Z. N. Gippius, 'Zadumchivyi strannik. O Rozanove', in her Zhivye litsa, 2 vols, Munich 1971 (reprint of Prague, 1925 edition), II, pp. 7-92 (first published in Paris (as A. Krainii): 'Zadumchivyi strannik. (O Rozanove)', Okno, 1924, 3, pp. 271-336).

4. E. F. Gollerbakh, V. V. Rozanov. Lichnost' i tvorchestvo, Petrograd, 1918.

5. These include, among others, E. F. Gollerbakh, 'O dvulikom', Vestnik literatury, 1919, 8, p. 13, 'Vospominaniia o V. V. Rozanove, (k trekhletiiu so dnia smerti)', Letopis' doma literatorov, 1922, 8-9, pp. 3-4, and 'Poslednie dni Rozanova. (K 4-oi godovshchine ego konchiny)', Nakanune, 39, 1 February 1923, Literaturnoe prilozhenie, pp. 5-7.

6. 'Rozanovskii kruzhek. Zametka', Vestnik literatury, 1921, 9, pp. 13-14.

7. One of the first activities of the circle was the distribution of questionnaires to prominent writers and critics in December 1921. The questionnaire asked for a personal estimation of Rozanov's talent, the recipient's view of possible comparisons of Rozanov with other writers, his influence on the recipient, information about his or her personal involvement with Rozanov and possible correspondences, and attitude towards the formation of a Rozanov study circle. The four existing replies were published in 1989 by Liudmila Il'iunina, '"Pishite, pishite no bez "pokhval'nogo slova"..."', Nashe nasledie, 1989, 6, pp. 61-63(62-63).

8. V. B. Shklovskii, Siuzhet kak iavlenie stilia, Petrograd, 1921. The section on Rozanov was published separately as Rozanov. Iz knigi "Siuzhet kak iavlenie stilia", Petrograd, 1922, and reprinted as 'Rozanov' in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, II, pp. 321-42.

9. V. B. Shklovskii, Zoo, ili pis'ma ne o liubvi, Sobranie sochinenii, ed. L. Polosina, 3 vols, Moscow, 1973-74, I, 1973, pp. 163-230(183).

10. Rozanov anticipated the formalists' interest in Gogol' by his insistence on Gogol''s supremely verbal art, and the power of his literary form. Tynianov argues that Rozanov first showed Gogol''s writing to be a supremely verbal construction that lacked a corresponding physical reality and defied plastic representation: see Iurii N. Tynianov, 'Illiustratsii', Texte der Russischen Formalisten, 2 vols, Munich, 1969 and 1972, I, ed. Witold Kosny, 1969, pp. 500-11(502). He also cites Rozanov's influence in 'Dostoevskii i Gogol'. (K teorii parodii)', in Texte der Russischen Formalisten, I, pp. 300-71, (302 and 336, n.22). Eikhenbaum cites Rozanov's Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore in 'Kak sdelana "shinel'" Gogolia', Texte der Russischen Formalisten, I, pp. 122-59 (142, n.5).

11. Il'in describes Rozanov's instinctive futurism, 'свой подлинный, футуристический гений', in V. N. Il'in, 'Stilizatsiia i stil'. 2 - Remizov i Rozanov', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 406-30 (420); originally published in Vozrozhdenie, 147, 1964, pp. 78-99.

12. Viktor Khovin, Na odnu temu, Petrograd, 1921, pp. 3-80; the articles by and on Rozanov are in Knizhnyi ugol, 4-8, 1918-1922, 4, pp. 5-11; 5, pp. 6-11; 6, the 1919 edition devoted to Rozanov's death, contains Khovin's 'Rozanov umer', pp. 3-6, and posthumously published articles by Rozanov, pp. 6-13; 7, pp. 3-8 and 8, pp. 9-12.

13. Anna Lisa Crone, Rozanov and the End of Literature. Polyphony and the Dissolution of Genre in Solitaria and Fallen Leaves, Wurzburg, 1978, pp. 122-26. The critic A. K. Zakrzhevskii compared Rozanov and Kruchenykh in terms of their confrontation with existing literary traditions in his book Rytsary bezumiia. (Futuristy), Kiev, 1914, pp. 133-34, footnote.

14. See V. Levin, '"Neklassicheskie" tipy povestvovaniia nachala XX veka v istorii russkogo literaturnogo iazyka', Slavica Hierosolymitana, 5-6, 1981, pp. 245-75; also Greta Slobin, 'Dinamika slukha i zreniia v poetike Alekseia Remizova', and Nina Gur'ianova, 'Remizov i "budetliane"', in Aleksei Remizov. Issledovaniia i materialy, ed. A. M. Gracheva, St Petersburg, 1994, pp. 157-65 and pp. 142-50 respectively.

15. Aleksei Remizov, 'Rozanov', in his Vstrechi. Peterburgskii buerak, Paris, 1981, pp. 103-14(112).

16. Greta N. Slobin, Remizov's Fictions 1900-1921, Dekalb, Illinois, 1991, p. 30.

17. Osip Mandel'shtam, 'O prirode slova', Sobranie sochinenii, ed. G. P. Struve and B. A. Filippov, 3 vols, Washington and New York, 1967-1971, II, New York, 1971, pp. 241-59(248-52). Slobin claims that Mandel'shtam's description of Rozanov as defender of the life of the word in Russian culture is equally applicable to Remizov (Remizov's Fictions, p. 66).

18. Slobin, Remizov's Fictions, p. 66.

19. Mandel'shtam and Tsvetaeva both showed an early love for Rozanov's writing. See Mandel'shtam's letter of 1908 to V. V. Gippius, Sobranie sochinenii, II, pp. 483-85(484). Anna Lisa Crone has argued that Rozanov was substantially influential in the formation of Mandel'shtam's prose style, although she perhaps exaggerates the extent of influence: see Anna Lisa Crone, 'Mandel'shtam's Rozanov', in Stoletie Mandel'shtama. Materialy simpoziuma, ed. Robin Aizlewood and Diana Myers, Tenafly, New Jersey, 1994, pp. 56-71. Tsvetaeva's letters to Rozanov are published in Marina Tsvetaeva, Sobranie sochinenii, ed. Anna Saakiantz and Lev Minukhin, 7 vols, Moscow, 1994-95, VI, Pis'ma, 1995, pp. 119-30; see also references to Rozanov in Viktoria Schweitzer, Tsvetaeva, London, 1992, especially pp. 17, 89, 92, 98, 106 and 270. Various critics have indicated a Rozanovian influence on Tsvetaeva's prose, particularly her autobiographical and diary prose style; see the reference to G. V. Adamovich's review in Zveno, Paris, 28 December 1925, in Tsvetaeva, Sobranie sochinenii, VII, p. 178, note 1 to letter 113.

20. L. D. Trotskii, 'Mistitsizm i kanonizatsiia Rozanova', in his Literatura i revoliutsiia, Moscow, 1991, pp. 46-49. See also Lunacharskii's criticism of Rozanov in A. V. Lunacharskii, Otkliki zhizni, St Petersburg, 1906, pp. 36-72.

21. See A. Belyi, Nachalo veka, Moscow, 1990, pp. 459-65.

22. A. N. Latynina, '"Vo mne proiskhodit razlozhenie literatury". V. V. Rozanov i ego mesto v literaturnoi bor'be epokhi', Voprosy literatury, 1975, 2, pp. 169-205.

23. 'Pis'ma A. M. Gor'kogo k V. V. Rozanovu i ego pomety na knigakh Rozanova', pub. L. N. Iokar, Kontekst, 1978, pp. 297-342.

24. Venedikt Erofeev, Glazami ekstsentrka, New York, 1982.

25. Venedikt Erofeev, Moskva-Petushki, Moscow, 1989; Svetlana Gaiser-Schmittmann emphasizes the Rozanovian inheritance in Erofeev's writing in her "Moskva-Petushki" - The Rest is Silence, New York, 1989. Viktor Sukach also emphasizes the importance of Rozanov's influence on Erofeev's thought and writing in 'O V. V. Rozanove. Interv'iu s V. G. Sukachom', interviewed by Natal'ia Skorobogat'ko, Nachala, 1991, 1, pp. 33-43(43).

26. V. V. Rozanov, O sebe i zhizni svoei, Moscow, 1990, compiled, introduction, commentary and indexes by V. G. Sukach; V. V. Rozanov, Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo... Polnoe sobranie putevykh ocherkov 1899-1913 gg., Moscow, 1994, compiled, edited and commentary by V. G. Sukach, in the series Sochineniia Vasilii Vasil'evicha Rozanova, edited by V. G. Sukach. See the bibliography and also note 35 for details of other recent republications of Rozanov's work.

27. A. Siniavskii, "Opavshie List'ia" V. V. Rozanova, Paris, 1982. See the recent essay on this book by Piatigorskii; A. Piatigorskii, '"Plemiannik svoego diadi" (Filosofskie zametki o knige A. Siniavskogo "Opavshie List'ia" V. V. Rozanova)', Izbrannye trudy, ed. G. Amelin, Moscow, 1996, pp. 242-50.

28. V. V. Rozanov, Izbrannoe, edited and introductory article (pp. 7-59) by Iu. P. Ivask, New York, 1956.

29. Iu. Ivask, 'Rozanov i o. Pavel Florenskii', Vestnik Russkogo Studencheskogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia, 42, 1956, pp. 22-26; and Konstantin Leont'ev. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo, Bern and Frankfurt, 1974, pp. 333-36 and 360-61.

30. Renato Poggioli, Rozanov, 2nd ed., London, 1962. See also 'On the Works and Thoughts of Vasily Rozanov', in his The Phoenix and the Spider, Cambridge, Mass., 1957, pp. 158-207.

31. These include Heinrich A. Stammeler, 'Apocalyptic Speculations in the Works of D. H. Lawrence and Vasilii Vasil'evich Rozanov', Die Welt der Slaven, 4, 1959, 1, pp. 66-73; an introductory article (in German) to V. V. Rozanov, Izbrannoe, ed. Evgeniia Zhiglevich, Munich, 1970, pp. i-xxxvii; a review of Essays in Russian Literature. The Conservative View: Leontiev, Rozanov, Shestov, ed. Spencer Roberts, Athens, 1968 in Slavic and East European Journal, 15, 1971, 1, pp. 121-22; 'Conservatism and Dissent: V. V. Rozanov's Political Philosophy', Russian Review, 32, 1973, 3, pp. 241-53; 'Apocalypse: V. V. Rozanov and D. H. Lawrence', Canadian Slavonic Papers, 16, 1974, 2, pp. 221-24; a review of A. L. Crone, Rozanov and the End of Literature, Wurzburg, 1978, in Russian Language Journal, 33, 1979, pp. 259-60; 'Vasily Rozanov as a Philosopher', Modern Age: A Quarterly Review, 28, 1984, 2-3, pp. 143-51; and Vasilii Vasil'evich Rozanov als Philosoph, Giessen,

1984.

32. See D. H. Lawrence's reviews of the Rozanov translations, 'Solitaria, by V. V. Rozanov' (review of V. V. Rozanov, Solitaria, trans. S. S. Kotelianskii, introductory article by E. Gollerbach, London, 1927) and 'Fallen Leaves, by V. V. Rozanov' (review of V. V. Rozanov, Fallen Leaves, trans. S. S. Kotelianskii, foreword by James Stephens, London, 1929), published in Phoenix. The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence, London, 2nd ed., 1961, pp. 367-71 and 388-92. Auden included 13 quotations from Rozanov (referred to as 'Rozinov') in his Faber Book of Aphorisms, ed. W. H. Auden and Louis Kronenburger, Boston, 1962 and London, 1964.

33. Anna Lisa Crone, 'Vasilii Rozanov and the End of Literature', PhD dissertation, Harvard University, 1975; published in 1978 as Rozanov and the End of Literature. Polyphony and the Dissolution of Genre in Solitaria and Fallen Leaves. In the early 1970s two other theses on Rozanov were produced in America: Zoreslava Kaulbach, 'The Life and Works of V. V. Rozanov', unpublished PhD dissertation, Cornell University, 1973; and Janet Schonwald Romanoff, 'Vasilii Rozanov - The Iurodivyi of Russian Literature', PhD dissertation, Stanford University, 1974 (published under the same title, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1975).

34. Rozanov and the End of Literature, p. 87.

35. These editions are Sobranie sochinenii (in progress), ed. A. N. Nikoliukin, Moscow, Respublika, 1994 - , so far comprising Mimoletnoe, 1994, V temnykh religioznykh luchakh, 1994, Sredi khudozhnikov, 1994, Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 1995, O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, 1995 and V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, 1995; and Sochineniia Vasilii Vasil'evicha Rozanova (in progress), ed. V. G. Sukach, Moscow, Tanais, so far comprising (of 5 volumes), Inaia zemlia. Inoe nebo..., 1994, and O ponimanii, 1996. For fuller details of the contents of these editions see the bibliography.

36. V. A. Fateev, V. V. Rozanov. Zhizn'. Tvorchestvo. Lichnost', Leningrad, 1991; Sergei Nosov, V. V. Rozanov. Estetika svobody, Dusseldorf and St Petersburg, 1993; V. K. Pishun and S. V. Pishun, "Religiia zhizni" V. Rozanova, Vladivostok, 1994.

37. The society was formed in 1991, under the presidency of M. A. Maslin: see M. A. Maslin, 'Vozrozhdenie Rozanovskogo obshchestva', Nachala, 1992, 3, pp. 95-96.

38. 'O prirode slova', pp. 248-50.



39. D. S. Mirsky, 'Contemporary Movements in Russian Literature', in his Uncollected Writings on Russian Literature, ed. G. S. Smith, Berkeley, 1989, pp. 258-82(265).

40. D. S. Mirsky, 'O moskovskoi literature i protopope Avvakume. (Dva otryvka)', Uncollected Writings on Russian Literature, pp. 145-55(154).

41. Remizov also connected Rozanov with Avvakum in Vstrechi, pp. 110-12.

42. See Mirsky, 'O moskovskoi literature i protopope Avvakume', pp. 154-55, and Levin, '"Neklassicheskie" tipy povestvovaniia', p. 252-54, which similarly argues against a too simplistic equation of 'conversational' speech styles in the writing of Rozanov, Remizov and Belyi with speech in life itself. Levin, like Mirsky, insists on this use of speech forms as a supremely literary device.

43. M. M. Bakhtin, Avtor i geroi v esteticheskoi deiatel'nosti, in M. M. Bakhtin, Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, comp. S. G. Bocharov, Moscow, 1979, pp. 7-180.

44. On parallels between Mandel'shtam and Bakhtin in this respect, see I. Iu. Iskrzhitskaia, 'P. Chaadaev - O. Mandel'shtam - M. Bakhtin. (K tipologii gumanitarnogo myshleniia)', in Bakhtin i filosofskaia kul'tura XX veka, ed. S. I. Aronova, Problemy bakhtinologii, 1, 2, St Petersburg, 1991, pp. 70-77.

# NOTES TO CHAPTER I

1. Osip Mandel'shtam, 'O prirode slova', p. 245. See also the essay by Irina Paperno, 'On the Nature of the Word: Theological Sources of Mandelshtam's Dialogue with the Symbolists', Christianity and the Eastern Slavs, ed. Boris Gasparov et al., 3 vols, II, Russian Culture in Modern Times, ed. Robert P. Hughes and Irina Paperno, Berkeley, 1994, pp. 287-310.

2. See Sergei Averintsev, 'Grecheskaia "literatura" i blizhnevostochnaia "slovesnost"'. Dva tvorcheskikh printsipa', in his Religiia i literatura, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1981, pp. 5-33.

3. 'Grecheskaia "literatura"', p. 33.

4. 'O prirode slova', pp. 247-48.

5. 'O prirode slova', p. 246.

6. Concerning parallels in the thought of Mandel'shtam and Bakhtin about writing and dialogue, see Iskrzhitskaia, 'P. Chaadaev - O. Mandel'shtam - M. Bakhtin', pp. 70-71 and 74-76, and James M. Curtis, 'Mikhail Bakhtin, Nietzsche, and Russian Pre-Revolutionary Thought', in Nietzsche in Russia, ed. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, Princeton, New Jersey, 1986, pp. 331-54(354).

7. See the discussion of Bakhtin's use of the term sobytiie by the editors S. S. Averintsev and S. G. Bocharov, in their commentary to M. M. Bakhtin, Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 384-85.

8. Avtor i geroi v esteticheskoi deiatel'nosti, p. 117. This work of the early 1920s was never finished, the extant text was first published in full in 1979 in the collection cited above. See also Vadim Liapunov's notes to the English translation of this work, Art and Answerability. Early Philosophical Essays by M. M. Bakhtin, ed. Michael Holquist, Vadim Liapunov, trans. Vadim Liapunov and Kenneth Bostrum, Austin, Texas, 1990, pp. 231-56, 318-25, and the introduction by Michael Holquist, pp. ix-xlix.

9. F. M. Dostoevskii, 'Na kakom iazyke govorit' budushchemu stolpu svoei rodiny?', Dnevnik pisatel'ia za 1876 g., July-August, 1876, ch.3, II, entitled 'Na kakom iazyke govorit' budushchemu otsu otechestva', Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, ed. V. G. Bazanov et al., 30 vols, Leningrad, 1972-1990, XXIII, 1981, pp. 80-84(82).

10. 'O prirode slova', p. 245.

11. See Versilov's conversation with Arkadii in Podrostok, part 3, chapter 7, I-III. He describes his role as a silent wanderer in Europe: 'Я скитался, мой друг, и твердо знал, что мне надо молчать и скитаться <...> пусть я ехал только скитаться (да я и знал, что еду только скитаться), но довольно и того, что я ехал с моею мыслью и с моим сознанием. Я повез туда свою русскую тоску.' F. M. Dostoevskii, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, XIII, 1975, pp. 376-77.

12. See William C. Brumfield, 'The West and Russia: Concepts of Inferiority in Dostoevsky's Adolescent', in Russianness, ed. Robert L. Belknap, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1990, pp. 144-52.

13. V. F. Ern, 'Nechto o Logose, russkoi filosofii i nauchnosti. Po povodu novogo filosofskogo zhurnala "Logos"', in Bor'ba za Logos, Sochineniia, comp. N. V. Kotrelev and E. V. Antonova, Moscow, 1991, pp. 9-294, 71-108(85).

14. 'Nechto o Logose', p. 86.

15. 'Nechto o Logose', p. 87.

16. 'Nechto o Logose', p. 88.

17. See M. M. Bakhtin, 'Iz zapisei 1970-1971 godov' and 'K Metodologii gumanitarnykh nauk' in M. M. Bakhtin, Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 336-60(342-43) and pp. 361-73(372-73). On the importance of lichnost' to Bakhtin's work see S. L. Bratchenko, 'Kontseptsia lichnosti: M. Bakhtin i psikhologiya', Bakhtin i filosofskaya kul'tura XX veka, ed. S. I. Aronova, Problemy bakhtinologii, 1, 1, St Petersburg, 1991, pp. 66-75(68).

18. 'Nechto o Logose', pp. 88-89. Bakhtin shows the inheritance of this attention to the human against the systematic in Russian thought, in his notes of 1970-71. He wrote: 'Безличная система наук (и вообще знания) и органическое целое сознания (или личности).' ('Iz zapisei 1970-1971 godov', p. 351).

19. V. F. Ern, G. S. Skovoroda, Moscow, 1912, pp. 20-21, quoted in A. F. Losev, 'Russkaya filosofiya', in his Filosofiya. Mifologiya. Kul'tura, comp. Iu. A. Rostovtsev, Moscow, 1991, pp. 209-36(216). Berdiaev also used the term lichnost' to describe Russia's need to evolve original forms and argued the crucial role of the logos in this process: 'Россия как бы бессильна сама себя оформить в бытие свободное, бессильна образовать из себя личность.' (Nikolai Berdiaev, Sud'ba Rossii, Moscow, 1990 (reprint of Moscow, 1918 edition), pp. 15-16); 'русская стихия требует оформляющего и светоносного логоса' (Sud'ba Rossii, p. 28).

20. Nadezhda Mandel'shtam emphasized this responsibility to language in her book Vtoraia kniga, where she argued that as soon as people begin to compromise their true natures, they begin to use false language. The sense of the original Word, Logos, is banished from a world in which people have abnegated their moral responsibility. She describes this situation in post-revolutionary Russia: 'Мы обмениваемся готовыми формулами, не замечая, что из них улетучился живой смысл. <...> Логосу нечего делать в нашем мире. Он вернется если люди когда-нибудь вспомнят, очнувшись, что человек отвечает за все, и прежде всего за свою душу.' (Nadezhda Mandel'shtam, Vtoraia kniga, Moscow, 1990, pp. 15-16).

21. 'Russkaia filosofiia', pp. 217-21.

22. A. F. Losev, Dialektika mifa, in his Filosofiia. Mifologiia. Kul'tura, pp. 21-186(75).

23. Rozanov drew a distinction between the litso that was made manifest in words, and central to the Arian religious tradition, and the Judaic innate sense of the sexual Lik, that was a connection to God. He calls this the 'first and most important, sacred face that is "not of this world"' (V. V. Rozanov, 'Nechto iz sedoi drevnosti' (1899), in V. V. Rozanov, Religiia i kul'tura, comp. E. V. Barabanov, Moscow, 1990, pp. 246-86(259)). Rozanov believed that in the Judaic tradition, man could communicate to God directly, through the sacred sexual act. He describes this intimate, sexual litso as a source of artistic, literary and philosophical creativity in his article, 'Iz zagadok chelovecheskoi prirody' (1898), in V. V. Rozanov, V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, ed. A. N. Nikoliukin, Moscow, 1995, pp. 21-39. The Christian or 'Arian' tradition has lost the immediate sense of the sacred in its contempt for the body and the physical world. Yet the longing for connection with God is just as urgent. Thus the Arian tradition makes up for this lack, by the energy of its communication in words. Its religious approach to the world is supremely verbal: 'арий <...> выражает в истории второе лицо в человеке, <...> - везде порядок слова или если и вещей, то через слово выражаемых, в слово связываемых, через слово преобразуемых и «о слове и в слове живущих»', ('Nechto iz sedoi drevnosti', pp. 258-59). This distinction is important for understanding the whole of Rozanov's literary activity, his conflicts between writing and the physical world, and his attempts to make his writing (and reading) as physically a part of himself as possible; it also relates to his interest in the sexuality of writers and distrust of those, most notably Merezhkovskii, who lacked a sexual energy and physical presence. Rozanov's parallels of his own writing with physical activity and sexual inspiration can also be seen as an attempt to draw closer, through his only medium, which was words, to the more direct, intimate Judaic forms of connection with the world and God.

24. Avtor i geroi, p. 114.
25. 'Nechto o Logose', p. 89.
26. 'Russkaia filosofiia', p. 213.
27. Anatoly Naiman, 'From prayer to howl. The Russianness of Russian literature', Times Literary Supplement, 4 September 1992, pp. 3-5(3).
28. See Iu. Ivask, 'Rozanov i o. Pavel Florenskii'; P. V. Palievskii, 'Rozanov i Florenskii', Literaturnaia ucheba, 1989, I, pp. 111-15; P. A. Florenskii, 'Iz pisem P. A. Florenskogo k docheri O. P. Florenskoi', comp. igumen Andronik (A. S. Trubachev) et al., Kontekst, 1991, pp. 93-99(97); Nikolai Berdiaev, Russkaia ideia, Paris, 1971, pp. 215-19, 226-29, and his article 'O vechno bab'em v russkoi dushe', in his Sud'ba Rossii, pp. 30-42; V. F. Ern's reply to Berdiaev, 'Nalet Val'kirii. (Otvét N. A. Berdiaevu)', Sochineniia, pp. 360-68; Lev Shestov, 'Pokhvala gluposti', in his Nachala i kontsy, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1978 (reprint of St Petersburg, 1908 edition), pp. 92-123(98), and Shestov, Lev, 'V. V. Rozanov', pub. V. A. Tunimanov, Russkaia literatura, 1991, 3, pp. 47-51; A. F. Losev, 'V poiskakh smysla. (Iz besed i vospominanii)', in his Strast' k dialektike. Literaturnye razmyshleniia filosofa, ed. S. N. Zenkin, intro. V. Erofeev, Moscow, 1990, pp. 14-67(52-55); also G. P. Fedotov, 'V. V. Rozanov. "Opavshie list'ia"', in his Litso Rossii, Paris, 1967, pp. 300-04; S. L. Frank, Iz istorii russkoi filosofskoi mysli kontsa XIX i nachala XX veka. Antologiiia, Washington and New York, 1965, pp. 113-14; V. V. Zen'kovskii, Istoriia russkoi filosofii, 2 vols, Paris, 1989 (reprint of Paris 1948-50 edition), I, pp. 457-68; and N. O. Losskii, Istoriia russkoi filosofii, Moscow, 1991, pp. 396-99.
29. See E. Gollerbakh, V. V. Rozanov. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo, Moscow, 1991, p. 44.
30. 'Contemporary Movements in Russian Literature', p. 265.
31. D. S. Mirsky, A History of Russian Literature, London, 1949, p. 423.
32. V. V. Rozanov, 'Skepticheskii um' (1901), in his Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972 (reprint of St Petersburg, 1906 edition), I, pp. 242-53(251). Because of Rozanov's extensive use of ellipsis, gaps in quotes are indicated, as here, by <...>. Any other ellipsis belongs to the text. Spellings follow the text quoted, including old spelling such as em, om. Most new publications of Rozanov keep these spellings, so I have kept them from original publications as well. Oddities of spelling, syntax and declension are also persistent in Rozanov's writing.
33. Frank, Iz istorii russkoi filosofskoi mysli, p. 113.

34. See Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist, Mikhail Bakhtin, Cambridge, Mass., 1984: Chapter 5, 'Religious Activities and the Arrest', Mikhail Bakhtin, pp. 120-45. For more on Bakhtin with reference to the pre-revolutionary religious and philosophical context in Russia see Caryl Emerson, 'Russian Orthodoxy and the Early Bakhtin', Religion and Literature, 22, 1990, 2-3, pp. 109-31; N. K. Bonetskaia, 'M. M. Bakhtin i traditsii russkoi filosofii', Voprosy filosofii, 1993, 1, pp. 83-93; and Bakhtin i filosofskaia kul'tura XX veka, ed. S. I. Aronova, St Petersburg, 1991, Problemy bakhtinologii, 1, 1 and 2, which includes several essays on Bakhtin and his relation to this context.

35. 'Iz zapisei 1970-1971 godov', p. 338. This view of language could be compared with the metaphysical approach to language of Walter Benjamin's early essays. Benjamin distinguished between the use of language as means and as supreme aim. The word as means was the narrow 'bourgeois' use of language, words used as commodities, for exchange and production, but there was another supreme aim of language beyond the small change of words. In this man approached God (see Walter Benjamin, 'On Language as Such and on the Language of Man', in his Reflections, ed. Peter Demetz, New York, 1986, pp. 314-32 and 'The Task of the Translator', in Illuminations, ed. Hannah Arendt, London, 1992, pp. 70-82).

36. On the religious resonances in Bakhtin's writing, see S. G. Bocharov, 'Ob odnom razgove i vokrug nego', Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2, 1993, pp. 70-89(80): 'Читая Бахтина, мы догадываемся, что некоторые основные модели христианской философии глубоко спрятаны в анализе ситуаций, которыми он занимался. <...> Религиозный аспект Бахтина глубок, но затаен, оттого и глубок, сокровенен как тема неизреченная. Очевидно, не по одним только внешним условиям это так. Затаен, как будто не позволяя нам судить об этом слишком решительно.' The importance of religion to Bakhtin is a subject of continuing debate. Clark and Holquist emphasize the importance of Bakhtin's religious engagement, and describe Bakhtin's early texts as a form of religious thought (Mikhail Bakhtin, pp. 61-62, 81-94, 120-33). Other critics, such as Vadim Liapunov, emphasize that Bakhtin should be understood in the German tradition of academic religious philosophy. He described this in a personal communication to Caryl Emerson, which she cites in her very important exploration of these views, and of Bakhtin's contribution to specifically Russian religious thought: Caryl Emerson, 'Russian Orthodoxy and the Early Bakhtin', p. 110, n.5; Emerson concludes: 'Bakhtin's religion is a very uncertain entity. As personal "faith" it might be inferred, but has proved difficult to document <...>. But in ways perhaps not readily apparent to his Western readers, Bakhtin can be said to qualify as a thinker in the Russian Orthodox tradition.' (p. 113). The recent article by N. K. Bonetskaia, 'M. M. Bakhtin i traditsii russkoi

filosofii', redresses the attacks on Bakhtin's Western interpreters by more extreme propagandists of the Russian tradition who would have Bakhtin entirely for themselves. The article assesses the possible Orthodox influences on Bakhtin's thought while pointing out Bakhtin's divergence from Russian religious traditions and emphasizing his attachment to Western thought (pp. 92-93). Caryl Emerson's essay 'The making of M. M. Bakhtin as Philosopher', in Russian Thought After Communism. The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage, ed. James. P. Scanlan, Armonk, New York, 1994, pp. 206-26, is an important review of the recent arguments and assessments of Bakhtin's relation to Russian Orthodox philosophy (on Vadim Kozhinov's attack on Bonetskaia, Makhlin and Western Bakhtin scholarship see p. 219).

37. Mikhail Bakhtin, p. 62.

38. Mikhail Bakhtin, pp. 76-77.

39. These notes, which include material for various larger projects (see Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, p. 406), were written between May 1970 and December 1971, when Bakhtin was living in an old people's home outside Moscow. Extracts have been published as 'Iz zapisei 1970-71 godov', Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 336-60, and 'Zametki' in M. M. Bakhtin, Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i, comp. S. G. Bocharov and V. V. Kozhinov, Moscow, 1986, pp. 509-31.

40. M. Bakhtin, Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo, Moscow, 1979, p. 10.

41. Bocharov, 'Ob odnom razgovore', p. 81; see also Petr Palievskii, 'Vasilii Vasil'evich Rozanov', Literaturnaia gazeta, 28 June 1989, 26, p.5. Another initiator of Bakhtin's rediscovery in Russia, Vladimir Turbin, writes about Bakhtin's discussion of Rozanov, and speculates on the way that Rozanov's writing was a necessary precursor to Bakhtin's work on carnival: Vladimir Turbin, 'Rozanov', Smena, 1990, 11, pp. 128-45.

42. Concerning the connections between Florenskii and Bakhtin see Mikhail Bakhtin, pp. 135-37; also Donatella Ferrari-Bravo, 'Poniatie slova u Bakhtina i Florenskogo', Europa Orientalis, 6, 1987, pp. 135-49 and 'More on Bakhtin and Florensky', Mikhail Bakhtin and the Epistemology of Discourse, ed. Clive Thomson, Critical Studies, 2, 1-2, Amsterdam and Atlanta, 1990, pp. 111-21; and N. K. Bonetskaia, 'Teoriia dialoga u M. Bakhtina i P. Florenskogo', in Bakhtin i filosofskaia kul'tura XX veka, 1, part 2, pp. 52-60. On Rozanov and Florenskii, see Iu. Ivask, 'Rozanov i o. Pavel Florenskii', and P. V. Palievskii, 'Rozanov i Florenskii', Literaturnaia ucheba, 1989, 1, pp. 114-15.

43. Bonetskaia sees Bakhtin's antipathy to unifying, transcendental knowledge as a crucial distinction between his thought and that of Orthodox philosophers such as Solov'ev, Florenskii, Losskii and Frank ( 'M. M. Bakhtin i traditsii russkoi filosofii', especially pp. 90-92).

44. See, for example, O. l. II: 484, 487, 492, 514-15.

45. Bocharov, 'Ob odnom razgovore', pp. 80-83.

46. Sergei Bocharov, in conversation, 31 December 1994.

47. See M. M. Bakhtin, 'Problema teksta v lingvistike, filologii i drugikh gumanitarnykh naukakh. Opyt filosofskogo analiza', in M. M. Bakhtin, Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 281-307 (305-06).

48. Avtor i geroi, p. 126.

49. See Rozanov's letter to Pertsov, XVI, 10-15 December, 1898, V. V. Rozanov, Sochineniia, comp. A. L. Nalepin and T. V. Pomeranskaia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 502-03(503). All further references to Rozanov's Sochineniia are to this edition.

50. Avtor i geroi, p. 125

51. Emmanuel Levinas, 'The Transcendence of Words', The Levinas Reader, ed. Sean Hand, Oxford, 1989, pp. 144-49(149). Levinas maintained that his own thought was formatively influenced by the philosophical issues in nineteenth century Russian literature, particularly Dostoevskii. His emphasis on communality and the other has parallels with the thought of Bakhtin: see, for example, the essay by A. Ponzio, '"Drugost'" u Bakhtina, Blansho i Levinasa', trans. T. A. Deineka, in Bakhtinologiia: Issledovaniia, perevody, publikatsii, comp., ed. K. G. Isupov, Problemy bakhtinologii, 2, Moscow, 1995, pp. 61-78.

52. Avtor i geroi, p. 124.

53. See Avtor i geroi, pp. 126-27.

54. Dmitrii Segal argues that this exclusively self-referential stance expressed in writing is the only way to a true self-uncovery: 'Писание и только оно эквивалентно раскрытию души, но при этом лишь, по словам Розанова, - писание для себя.' (D. Segal, 'Literatura kak okhrannaia gramota', Slavica Hierosolymitana, 5-6, 1981, pp. 151-244(187)).

55. V. V. Rozanov, 'Missionerstvo i missionary' (1901-03), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, I, pp.175-227(181).

56. Avtor i geroi, p. 14.



57. Avtor i geroi, p. 125.

58. V. V. Rozanov, Legenda o velikom inkvizitore F. M. Dostoevskogo. Opyt kriticheskogo kommentariia (1891) in V. V. Rozanov, Nesovmestimye kontrasty zhitiia. Literaturno-esteticheskie raboty raznykh let, comp. V. V. Erofeev, Moscow, 1990, pp. 37-224 (71-72). Although this publication uses lower case letters in the title, I have referred to this work in the text as Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore, in accordance with the original book publications of 1894, 1902, and 1906, as listed in V. G. Sukach's bibliography, De Visu, 1993, 3, pp. 62-67.

59. See Sukach's commentary in O sebe i zhizni svoei, pp. 759-60.

60. O sebe i zhizni svoei, p. 759.

61. See 'Literatura kak okhrannaia gramota', pp. 186-87: 'Писание Розанова питается двумя источниками: сознанием своей несоввершенности и своей несчастью. И здесь - в процессе писания - автор избывает свою несчастью и несоввершенство. Но одновременно - в силу неудержимости и бесконечности этого внутреннего порыва к самораскрытию - каждый акт выговаривания ведет к новому состоянию несоввершенства и несчастья.'

62. 'Literatura kak okhrannaia gramota', p. 185.

63. See Clark and Holquist, Mikhail Bakhtin, pp. 75-76.

64. Avtor i geroi, p. 110. Bakhtin's use of the word lichina, to imply a false state of 'completed' existence, has a religious resonance, as discussed in the earlier section on litso and Logos. Segal also uses the image of the face in his evaluation of Rozanov's writing: 'это уже не словесная маска, а само лицо' ('Literatura kak okhrannaia gramota', pp. 183-84).

65. Avtor i geroi, p. 112.

66. Avtor i geroi, p. 124.

67. Avtor i geroi, p. 124.

68. See Avtor i geroi, p. 128: 'Постановка дружности (возможного другого, слушателя, читателя) в романтизме носит человекоборческий характер (совершенно своеобразно отношение Ипполита в «Идиоте» Достоевского, также человека из подполья).'

69. Letter to Pertsov, XVI, 10-15 December 1898, Sochineniia, p. 503.

70. Avtor i geroi, pp. 31-32.

71. 'Zametki', p. 516.

72. Avtor i geroi, p. 125.

73. Avtor i geroi, p. 111.

74. Ferdinand Ebner, an Austrian writer who anticipates the writing of Buber and Bakhtin by the revolutionary rediscovery of a 'thou' in theology, also saw sin as a fundamental catalyst in the approach to God, or the absolute Other. He wrote: 'Only when the recognition of sin becomes word and avowal does man emerge without reservation out of his ego-isolation and into a relationship to God, who is the true "thou" of his "I".' (Quoted in Erasmo Leiva-Merikakis, The Blossoming Thorn. Georg Trakl's Poetry of Atonement, Lewisburg, 1987, p. 41). Ebner argued that the gap between man and the world can only be bridged through turning oneself outwards to God, in words. This takes place most directly through the recognition of sin. Guilt promises liberation, since it is absolutely dependent on the grace of the Other (The Blossoming Thorn, pp. 127-28).

75. V. V. Rozanov, 'Embryony' (1899), Religiia i kul'tura, pp. 287-96(291). Rozanov also argues the crucial role of sin and error as the way to truth and new birth in V. V. Rozanov, 'O Dostoevskom' (1894), Sochineniia, pp. 170-84(174).

76. See Avtor i geroi, p. 127.

77. Concerning the central importance of the sigh in Rozanov's writing see Viktor Khovin, Ne ugodno-li-s?! Siluet V. V. Rozanova, Petrograd, 1916, pp. 17-18.

78. V. V. Rozanov, 'O pisateliakh i pisatel'stve' (1899), Sochineniia, pp. 231-47(235).

79. V. V. Rozanov, Posle Sakharny (1913), pub. Viktor Sukach, Literaturnaia ucheba, 1989, 2, pp. 79-122(98).

80. V. V. Rozanov, 'Novye embriony' (1901), Religiia i kul'tura, pp. 296-306(296).

81. V. V. Rozanov, 'Religiia - kak svet i radost'' (1899), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, I, pp. 1-22(19).

82. 'Religiia - kak svet i radost'', p. 20.

83. 'Perepiska V. V. Rozanova i M. O. Gershenzona. 1909-1918', Novyi mir, 1991, 3, pub. V. Proskurina, pp. 215-42(224).

84. For a discussion of Rozanov and the confessional genre see Anna Lisa Crone, 'Rozanov and Autobiography: The Case of Vasily Vasilievich', in Autobiographical Statements in Twentieth Century Russian Literature, ed. Jane Gary Harris,

Princeton, New Jersey, 1990, pp. 36-51(36-45).

85. Avtor i geroi, p. 126.

86. See also Smert.: 150-51, n. 31.

87. Nadezhda Mandel'shtam describes pain similarly as a way to force out utterance and thus break with the seemingly self-sufficient isolation of things. She also emphasizes pain as a source of relationship to reality; it is the energy that fuels writing about oneself, and yet gives it a broader connection, beyond the temporary confines of oneself: '<...> боль вроде закваски, на которой поднимается слово, мысль, ощущение действительности и подлинных связей в этом мире. Без боли никто еще не различил живого начала, которое строит и укрепляет жизнь, от противопоставленного ему, мертвого и разрушающего, но почему-то всегда очень привлекательного и с первого взгляда логически устойчивого, а может даже, неотвратимого. Боль сейчас сильна, и я собираюсь писать о себе, о себе и только о себе, но это вовсе не значит, что я буду говорить о себе.' (Vtoraia kniga, p. 16).

88. Bakhtin also questions God's abstracted distance from suffering, in Avtor i geroi, p. 113.

89. As Rozanov wrote, this was the power of Dostoevskii's writing: 'Туда, куда зовет он, - в мир искажения и страдания <...> можно пойти действительно, забыв и мир красоты, <...> и холодные сферы науки, <...>. Ведь идти туда - значит удовлетворить глубочайшим потребностям своего сердца, которому как-то сродно страдание, оно имеет необъяснимый уклон к нему; и пойти с такою целью - это значит ответить на главный запрос ума, который он снова и снова высказывает сквозь все, чем пытается развлечь его наука и философия.' (Legenda o velikom inkvizitore, p. 62).

90. Legenda o velikom inkvizitore, p. 83.

91. Letter to Leont'ev, VII, 14 August 1891, Sochineniia, pp. 481-87(482).

92. V. V. Rozanov, 'Okolo boliashchikh' (1898), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., pp. 3-9(9, footnote).

93. V. V. Rozanov, 'A. P. Chekhov' (1910), Sochineniia, pp. 410-20(411).

94. 'Grecheskaia "literatura"', p. 29. Averintsev uses Dostoevskii as an example of writing that cannot be constrained by the definitions of 'character' which have developed from the traditions of Hellenic literary study, and is more closely linked to the dynamism of the Near Eastern tradition: see 'Grecheskaia "literatura"', p. 21, n.1.

95. Sergei Averintsev, 'Na perekrestke literaturnykh traditsii', in his Religiia i literatura, pp. 34-67(44).
96. 'Grecheskaia "literatura"', p. 11.
97. Conversation with Viktor Sukach, Moscow, December 1994.
98. 'Grecheskaia "literatura"', p. 16.
99. 'Grecheskaia "literatura"', pp. 18-19.
100. V. V. Rozanov, 'Slovo Bozhie v nashem uchen'i' (1900), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, I, pp. 124-174(137).
101. V. V. Rozanov, 'Dekadenty' (1904), Sochineniia, pp. 430-42(439).
102. V. V. Rozanov, Iz pripominanii i myslei ob A. S. Suvorine (1913), Moscow, 1992, p. 55.
103. For further discussion of Rozanov and prophecy, see the chapter 'Osobennosti profetizma V. Rozanova' in V. K. Pishun and S. V. Pishun, "Religiia zhizni" V. Rozanova, pp. 63-76.
104. V. V. Rozanov, 'Istinnyi "fin de siècle"' (1898), V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, pp. 54-60(58).
105. 'Grecheskaia "literatura"', pp. 16-17.
106. 'Istinnyi "fin de siècle"', p. 59.
107. V. V. Rozanov, 'Khristos - sudiia mira' (1903), in Temnyi lik (1911), Religiia i kul'tura, pp. 369-582, 542-559(553).
108. 'Khristos - sudiia mira', p. 552.
109. V. V. Rozanov, Russkaia Tserkov' (1906), Religiia i kul'tura, pp. 327-354(349).
110. V. V. Rozanov, 'Ob a-dogmatizme khristianstva' (1906), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, II, pp. 454-72(465).
111. Posle Sakharny, p. 91.
112. 'Grecheskaia "literatura"', p. 30.
113. Posle Sakharny, p. 116.
114. This has been noted by Nosov, among others, who writes that Rozanov resurrected the role of prophet in an unprophetic age: see his V. V. Rozanov. Estetika svobody, pp. 143-44.

115. V. V. Rozanov, 'Avtobiografiia 1909 goda', quoted by Viktor Sukach in O sebe i zhizni svoei, p. 11.

116. See the description of the role of iurodivye in G. P. Fedotov, Sviatye drevnei Rusi, Moscow, 1990, pp. 198-209. In the Russian tradition, iurodivye were historically connected with prophecy, and Fedotov claims that almost all iurodivye were assumed to possess this gift (p. 201).

117. See, for example, A. I. Bogdanovich, 'Iurodstvuiushchaia literatura - "O liubvi" Men'shikova. "Sumerki prosveshcheniia" V. Rozanova', Mir Bozhii, 1899, 4, pp. 1-18; V. P. Burenin, 'Kriticheskie ocherki. Literaturnoe iurodstvo i klikushestvo', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, I, pp. 303-13; and R. V. Ivanov-Razumnik, 'Iurodivyi russkoi literatury', in his Tvorchestvo i kritika, 3 vols, St Petersburg, 1910-13, II, 1911, pp. 180-211.

118. Avtor i geroi, pp. 127-28.

119. Avtor i geroi, p. 127.

120. 'Skepticheskii um', p. 246.

121. Osip Mandel'shtam, 'Pushkin i Skriabin. (Fragmenty)', Sobranie sochinenii, II, pp. 313-19(315).

122. Posle Sakharny, p. 94.

123. '<...> я вошел «голым перед людьми» («У.» и «Оп. л.»)', Posle Sakharny, p. 98.

124. V. V. Rozanov, 'Oдна из zamechatel'nykh idei F. M. Dostoevskogo' (1911), Nachala, 1991, 1, pp. 54-65(57-58).

125. V. V. Rozanov, 'Kto istinnyi vinovnik etogo?', Russkoe obozrenie, 1896, 8, pp. 640-55(655).

126. Letter from Gershenzon to Rozanov, 8 March 1912, 'Perepiska V. V. Rozanova i M. O. Gershenzona' p. 231. The scholar and philosopher V. A. Kozhevnikov similarly praised Rozanov's candour in Uedinennoe, anticipating Rozanov's own declarations of nakedness in Opavshie list'ia: 'S-te Beuve (критик тонкий) сказал: «крупного человека, известного писателя, художника и т. д. можно узнать, только когда увидишь его в халате, запросто, дома.» А я хотел бы сказать (выражаясь образно, конечно!): «пожалуй, и без халата даже!»' (Letter to Rozanov, 14 April 1912, 'Pis'ma V. A. Kozhevnikova V. V. Rozanovu', Vestnik Russkogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia, 143, 1984, 4, pp. 87-100(87)).

127. Konstantin Leont'ev, Pis'ma k Vasiliiu Rozanovu, London, 1981, p. 26.

128. 'Prishvin o Rozanove', pub. L. A. Riazanova, Kontekst, 1990, pp. 161-218(170).
129. 'Prishvin o Rozanove', p. 185.
130. Avtor i geroi, pp. 124-25.
131. Avtor i geroi, pp. 105-06.

NOTES TO CHAPTER II

1. V. V. Rozanov, 'Psikhika i byt studenchestva', Novyi put', 1904, 3, pp. 121-34(122)
2. 'Embriony', pp. 287-88
3. 'Dekadenty', p. 438.
4. V. V. Rozanov, 'O pis'makh pisatelei' (1909), in V. V. Rozanov, O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, ed. A. N. Nikoliukin, Moscow, 1995, pp. 430-33(430).
5. V. V. Rozanov, 'Psikhologiiia russkogo raskola' (1896), Religiia i kul'tura, pp. 47-81(54).
6. Posle Sakharny, p. 116.
7. 'Istinnyi "fin de siècle"', p. 60.
8. 'Psikhologiiia russkogo raskola', pp. 75-76.
9. See Avtor i geroi, p. 116.
10. Avtor i geroi, p. 118.
11. V. V. Rozanov, 'O simvolistakh. Pis'mo v redaktsiiu', Russkoe obozrenie, 1896, 9, pp. 318-21(318-20).
12. Avtor i geroi, p. 109.
13. Dmitrii Segal argues that Rozanov successfully achieved the stylistic embodiment of his thought: 'розановские размышления всегда автометадескриптивны в отношении формы текста и формы души, возводимых, в конечном счете, к одному источнику' ('Literatura kak okhrannaia gramota', p. 187).
14. Levinas echoes this thought when he confronts the same problem of printed words: 'Words are disfigured or "frozen" when language is transformed into documents and vestiges. The living word struggles against this transfer of thought into vestige, it struggles with the letter that appears when there is no-one there to hear.' ('The Transcendence of Words', pp. 148-49).
15. 'Religiia - kak svet i radost'', pp. 4-5.
16. 'O simvolistakh', p. 318.
17. Levin, '"Neklassicheskie" tipy povestvovaniia', pp. 245-75.

18. Rozanov claimed the psychological reason for his writing was a 'ceaseless noise', 'Неумолчный шум в душе' [O. l. II: 268].

19. V. V. Rozanov, Mimoletnoe (1915), in V. V. Rozanov, Mimoletnoe, ed. A. N. Nikoliukin, Moscow, 1994, pp. 7-334(226).

20. V. V. Rozanov, 'Schastlivyi obladatel' svoikh sposobnostei', Mir iskusstva, 8, 1902, Khudozhestvennaia khronika, pp. 29-31(31).

21. V. V. Rozanov, 'Tri momenta v razvitii russkoi kritiki' (1892), Sochineniia, pp. 154-169(160).

22. Letter to Leont'ev, III, undated, 1891, Sochineniia, pp. 473-78(475).

23. Legenda o velikom inkvizitore, p. 62.

24. V. V. Rozanov, '28-go ianvaria 1881-1901 g.' (1901), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, I, pp. 234-38(238).

25. Rozanov was not always confident of his literary style, and in a letter to Pertsov he complained that the difficulties of making a literary career had ruined his style: 'Да, голубчик мой, я вот 8 лет бьюсь в литературе, приноровляясь; и эта нервность приноровления, между прочим, погубила мой слог, когда-то легкий и ясный. <...> А в литературе, выражение, стиль, манера, это сочетание силы и легкости - есть все.' (Letter to Pertsov, XIII, August 1898, Sochineniia, pp. 500-01(501)). However, other writers, while criticizing the extremes of his arguments, claimed that Rozanov's style was his greatest strength; for example, Strakhov: 'какой слог, какое прелестное течение речи, какая выразительность и образность' (Letter to Rozanov, 23 February 1891, Lit. izg.: 349). Gershenzon compared Rozanov's style with Pushkin's: 'В Вашем слоге совсем нет лигатуры. Только и есть такой язык - у Вас в Ваших лучших страницах, да в письмах Пушкина: чистый расплавленный сверкающий металл без всякой примеси. Только что у Пушкина он более упруг и у вас льется жиже.' (Letter to Rozanov, 8 May 1909, 'Perepiska V. V. Rozanova i M. O. Gershenzona', p. 221).

26. N. N. Strakhov, 'Tiazheloe vremia. Pis'mo v redaktsiiu "Vremeni"' (Vremia, October, 1862), in his Iz istorii literaturnogo nigilizma, The Hague, 1967 (reprint of St Petersburg, 1890 edition), pp. 149-82(155).

27. Lev Shestov, Apofeoz bespochvennosti, Leningrad, 1991, p. 33.

28. Apofeoz bespochvennosti, p. 36.



29. See, for example, Siniavskii, "Opavshie List'ia", p. 186, and Fedotov, 'V. Rozanov "Opavshie list'ia"', in his Litso Rossii, p. 300.
30. Letter to N. O. Lerner, undated, (TsGALI. F. 419. Op. 1. Ed. khr. 281) quoted in Viktor Sukach's introduction to O sebe i zhizni svoei, p. 27.
31. V. V. Rozanov, 'Novaia religiozno-filosofskaia kontseptsia Nikolaia Berdiaeva. "Smysl tvorchestva. Opyt opravdaniia cheloveka"' (1916), in N. A. Berdiaev: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. A. A. Ermichev, St Petersburg, 1994, pp. 261-69(264-65). Rozanov wrote this article under the pseudonym 'Petrogradskii starozhil'.
32. Mikhail Bakhtin, pp. 7-8.
33. V. V. Rozanov, 'Zhenshchina pered velikoiu zadacheiu' (1898), Religiia i kul'tura, pp. 228-46(238-239).
34. V. V. Rozanov, 'Ob odnoi osobennoi zaslude Vl. S. Solov'eva' (1904), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, II, pp. 367-83(377).
35. 'Ob a-dogmatizme khristianstva', p. 460.
36. 'Psikhologiya russkogo raskola', p. 52.
37. V. V. Rozanov, 'Irodova legenda' (1901), V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, pp. 40-53(43).
38. V. V. Rozanov, 'O drevnikh i novykh zhertvakh' (1902), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, II, pp. 435-50(447-48).
39. 'Zhenshchina pered velikoiu zadacheiu', pp. 239-40.
40. Russkaia Tserkov', pp. 337-338.
41. Sud'ba Rossii, p. 223.
42. N. A. Berdiaev, Samopoznanie, Moscow, 1991, pp. 74-82(80). Berdiaev's avowed repulsion from pregnant women contrasts with Rozanov's enthrallment by this state, his wish to see the whole world pregnant.
43. 'Zhenshchina pered velikoiu zadacheiu', p. 240.
44. Letter to Pertsov, XXII, 9 April 1899, Sochineniia, pp. 508-09(508).
45. 'Zhenshchina pered velikoiu zadacheiu', pp. 243-44.
46. 'Na perekrestke literaturnykh traditsii', p. 44.
47. 'Na perekrestke literaturnykh traditsii', p. 45, n.2.

48. 'Nechto iz sedoi drevnosti', p. 264.
49. Belyi's formulations are at times close to Rozanov's: 'содержание религии, поэзии, метафизики - музыкальный пафос души'; 'Вся культура выросла из песен и плясок.' (Andrei Belyi, 'Pesn' zhizni', in his Simvolizm kak miroponimanie, comp. L. A. Sugai, Moscow, 1994, pp. 167-77(171 and 173)).
50. Posle Sakhar'ny, p. 117.
51. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 321.
52. Letter to Gor'kii, after 4 November 1905, Mysli o literature, comp. A. N. Nikoliukin, Moscow, 1989, pp. 511-15(511).
53. 'Mimoletnoe. (Iz vlecheniia)' (1914, unpublished), pub. S. Bocharov and V. Sukach, Opyty. literaturno-filosofskii sbornik, ed. S. S. Averintsev et al., comp. A. V. Gulyga, Moscow, 1990, pp. 294-315(308).
54. 'Как шум отдаленного прибоя, звучит автору его ритмическое единство. Темы уходят и возвращаются, и снова уходят, и снова возвращаются, <...> каждый раз наполняясь по-новому содержанием и соком жизни.' P. A. Florenskii, 'Puti i sredotochiia', in P. A. Florenskii, U vodorazdelov mysli, comp. igumen Andronik, M. S. Trubacheva and P. V. Florenskii, Moscow, 1990, (Volume II of the 2 volumes of P. A. Florenskii in the series 'Iz istorii otechestvennoi filosofskoi mysli'), pp. 26-40(29).
55. 'Religiia - kak svet i radost'', p. 13.
56. 'O Dostoevskom' p. 177. Rozanov's image of the chorus as the culmination of Dostoevskii's anticipated truth has parallels in Florenskii's writing. Florenskii also put forward the idea of a 'heterophony' in thought, as in a musical chorus: 'Единство достигается внутренним взаимопониманием исполнителей, а не внешними рамками.' ('Puti i sredotochiia', p. 30). He describes the creative 'mnogogolosiiia' of Russian choral song, which he claims is the model for his own writing: 'В философии здесь автору хочется сказать то самое, что поет в песне душа русского народа.' ('Puti i sredotochiia', p. 31). Florenskii's ideas on the freedom and unity of Russian song also anticipate Bakhtin's analysis of Dostoevskii's novels in Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo: 'полная свобода всех голосов, «сочинение» их друг с другом, в противоположность подчинению' ('Puti i sredotochiia', p. 30).
57. Footnote to letter from Leont'ev, in Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 50, n.10.
58. Letter to Turgenev, 23 December 1863, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, XXVIII, kn. II, letter 212, pp. 60-61(61).

59. 'Istinnnyi "fin de siècle"', p. 60.

60. V. V. Rozanov, 'S vershiny tysiacheletnei piramidy. (Razmyshlenie o khode russkoi literatury)' (1918), Sochineniia, pp. 448-64(450).

61. Russkaia Tserkov', pp. 334-35. In a note in the margins of a letter to Gor'kii, Rozanov asserts his sense of the importance of song to contemporary life: 'песня - душа века, но лучшая, плачущая о себе или над собою' (Letter to Gor'kii, after 4 November 1905, Mysli o literature, p. 511).

62. Russkaia Tserkov', p. 349.

63. V. V. Rozanov, 'Po tikhim obiteliam' (1904), Religiia i kul'tura, pp. 382-421(405). See also O. l. I: 247.

64. V. V. Rozanov, 'Avtoportret Vl. S. Solov'eva' (1908), Obshchestvennaia mysl': Issledovaniia i publikatsii, I, 1989, pp. 232-47(242).

65. Rozanov also refers to this Biblical maintenance of silence as a religious attitude in Okolo tserkovnykh sten: 'В Библии имя Божие никогда не произносилось; читая Библию, древние обходили имя, и видя четыре буквы, Его обозначавшие, выговаривали не их, а другое слово.' (V. V. Rozanov, 'Ogni sviashchennye' (1905), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, II, pp. 1-13(8)).

66. Letter to Leont'ev, III, undated, 1891, Sochineniia, pp. 473-78(474).

67. V. V. Rozanov, 'Brak i khristianstvo. (Iz perepiski s pravoslavnym sviashchennikom)' (1898), V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, pp. 107-39(109, footnote).

68. 'Dekadenty', pp. 438-39.

69. V. V. Rozanov, 'Ugolok Bessarabii' (1913), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., pp. 567-94(592).

70. See V. V. Rozanov, 'Estonskoe zatish'e' (1903) and 'Russkii Nil. (Vpechatleniia na Volge)' (1907), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 54-66(55) and pp. 329-407(339), on the spiritual exhaustion caused by the continual fragmentary impressions of city life.

71. V. V. Rozanov, 'Iz zhizni, iskanii, i nabliudeni studentchestva', first published in the St Petersburg student journal Veshnie vody, 1915, 13-14, p. 89. Republished extract in Viktor Sukach, 'Zhizn' Vasiliia Vasil'evicha Rozanova "kak ona est"', Moskva, 1991, 11, pp. 141-53(147).

72. Kagan is one of the critics who sees Rozanov's prolixity as a literary contrivance: see Iosif Kagan, 'Put' Rozanova', Obshchestvennye nauki, 1990, 5, pp. 201-12(212).

73. Letter to Gollerbakh, 7 June 1918, 'Pis'ma Vasiliia Rozanova Erikhu Gollerbakhu', Lepta, 1991, 5, pp. 139-42(140).

74. Letter to B. A. Griftsov, I, 16 August 1909, 'Pis'ma k B. A. Griftsovu', pub. E. V. Barabanov, Nashe nasledie, 1989, 6, pp. 57-61(57).

75. N. N. Strakhov, 'Nechto o molchanii', Iz istorii literaturnogo nigilizma, pp. 568-71(570).

76. Entry for 22 September 1899, Dnevnik A. S. Suvorina, ed. M. Krichevskii, Moscow - Petrograd, 1923, pp. 210-12(211).

77. Florenskii, 'Antinomiia iazyka', p. 169.

78. 'Nechto o Logose', p. 90.

79. Ern, 'Nechto o Logose', p. 90. Mandel'shtam's poem of 1910, 'Silentium', demonstrates this inheritance of the Russian tradition of logos, music and silence as the creative potential linking all living things. (Sobranie sochinenii, I, p. 9). The title looks back to Tiutchev's famous poem, which Rozanov also valued: 'Прав тысячу раз Тютчев, что все выразимое - неистинное, а все истинное - невыразимое' (V. V. Rozanov, 'Pamiati Vl. Solov'eva', Mir iskusstva, 15-16, 1900, pp. 33-36(34)).

80. 'Iz zapisei 1970-1971 godov', pp. 337-38.

81. V. V. Rozanov, 'V muzeiakh Vatikana' (1901), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., pp. 130-41(131).

82. As Averintsev warns in his comparison of the Near Eastern and Hellenic approaches to the word, 'когда литература вбирает в себя основной смысл всей культуры в целом, смысл, который не может быть реализован помимо литературы, - тогда вступает в действие принцип «рукописи не горят».' ('Grecheskaia "literatura"', p. 33).

83. Reference is from unnumbered proofs of V. V. Rozanov, O F. M. Dostoevskom i grafe L. N. Tolstom, forthcoming in the series Sochineniia Vasiliia Vasil'evicha Rozanova, edited by V. G. Sukach.

84. V. V. Rozanov, V sosedstve Sodoma. (Istoki Izrailia), St Petersburg, 1914, p. 1.

85. Letter to G. A. Lopatin, undated, Sochineniia, pp. 519-20(519).

86. V. V. Rozanov, 'Pozdnie fazy slavianofil'stva' (1895), Sochineniia, pp. 183-201(195-96).
87. Posle Sakharny, p. 120, n.56.
88. V. V. Rozanov, 'Pamiati usopshikh' (1896), Sochineniia, pp. 216-30(225).
89. V. V. Rozanov, 'Pamiati N. I. Storozhenko', originally published in Novoe vremia, 18 January 1906, p. 3, extract quoted in Sukach, 'Zhizn' Vasiliia Vasil'evicha Rozanova "kak ona est"', Moskva, 1991, 11, p. 142.
90. '"Neklassicheskie" tipy povestvovaniia', p. 264.
91. 'S vershiny tysiacheletnei piramidy', pp. 449-50.
92. V. V. Rozanov, L. N. Tolstoi i Russkaia Tserkov' (1912), Religiia i kul'tura, pp. 365-368(367).
93. 'O prirode slova', pp. 248-49. Nadezhda Mandel'shtam described a similar threat for a later generation in Vtoraia kniga. She quotes exactly the same passage of 'O prirode slova' on the loss of language that would lead to historical death, yet her words about Mandel'shtam, 'вся его жизнь ушла на защиту <...>', echo Mandel'shtam's own description of Rozanov: 'Для Мандельштама «филология» - глубокое и нравственное понятие. Ведь слово воплощает в себе смысл, Логос. <...> а вся его жизнь ушла на защиту того, что он называл «филологией» и связывал с внутренней свободой, а мы жили в царстве мертвых, лишенных смысла слов, которыми дурманили народ. Живое слово в церкви, в семье, в своем кругу, среди друзей и поэтов, составляющих «мы» и охраняющих единые ценности, - вот что Мандельштам надеялся найти в Петербурге двадцатого года.' (Vtoraia kniga, p. 57).
94. M. M. Bakhtin, 'Problema rechevykh zhanrov', Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 237-80(268).
95. Barabanov emphasizes Rozanov's value for the word uttered in the midst of family life as an alternative to the impersonal and 'nominalist' use of the word: 'цивилизации христианского номинализма Розанов противопоставил не молчание, но слово, - всегда личное, всегда свое, крепко укорененное в «святынях жизни»: ,в реальности домашнего быта, конкретной судьбы <...>. Верность этому слову в ситуации, где на карту поставлена судьба собственной семьи, «друга», детей, и открыла Розанову то особое мифологическое пространство, в котором набирало силу его движение в защиту попорченных святынь.' (E. V. Barabanov, introduction to Religiia i kul'tura, pp. 3-16(13)).
96. V. V. Rozanov, 'Ot avtora', 'V svoem uglu', Novyi put', 1903, 2, pp. 135-52(135-36).

97. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 161.
98. Avtor i geroi, p. 126.
99. Mikhail Bakhtin, p. 207. See Mikhail Bakhtin, pp. 206-11, for further discussion of the role of intonation in Bakhtin's work. V. N. Voloshinov's articles, 'Slovo v zhizni i slovo v poezii', Zvezda, 1926, 6, pp. 244-67, and 'O granitsakh poetiki i lingvistiki', in V bor'be za marksizm v literaturnoi nauke, Leningrad, 1930, pp. 203-40, are important documents of Bakhtinian thought on intonation. See also Tzvetan Todorov, Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle, Manchester, 1984, pp. 48-49.
100. P. A. Florenskii, Stolp i utverzhdienie istiny, comp. igumen Andronik, M. S. Trubacheva and P. V. Florenskii, Moscow, 1990 (Volume I, parts I and II, of the 2 volume P. A. Florenskii, published in the series 'Iz istorii otechestvennoi filosofskoi mysli'), I, pp. 15-17.
101. A. F. Losev, Ocherki antichnogo simvolizma i mifologii, Moscow, 1993, p. 870.
102. 'Istinnyi "fin de siècle"', p. 34.
103. 'Zadumchivyi strannik', p. 9.
104. 'Pesn' zhizni', p. 172.
105. 'Nechto o Logose', p. 90.
106. V. V. Rozanov, 'Zametka o vazhneishikh techniiakh russkoi filosofskoi mysli v sviazi s nashei perevodnoi literaturoi po filosofii', Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii, 3, 1890, Spetsial'nyi otdel, pp. 1-34(11). Konstantin Leont'ev also saw the balance between knowledge and what is not known as essential to the development of a culture: 'знание и незнание не суть ли равносильные орудия или условия развития'. (K. N. Leont'ev, 'Srednii evropeets kak ideal i orudie vsemirnogo razrusheniia', Izbrannoe, comp. I. N. Smirnov, Moscow, 1993, pp. 119-68(123)).
107. V. V. Rozanov, 'Dary Tserery (Shekhiny)', Novy put', 1903, 6, 138-52(150).
108. Okolo tserkovnykh sten, I, p. xi.
109. Okolo tserkovnykh sten, I, p. xiii.
110. 'Slovo Bozhie v nashem uchenii', p. 129; in this volume see also Rozanov's account of the popular preference for the mysterious 'Kheruvimskaia' prayer over the rational and literal 'Otche nash' in V. V. Rozanov, 'Golosa iz provintsii o missionerstve' (1901-03), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, I, pp. 192-214(198-99).

111. V. V. Rozanov, 'Literaturnye i politicheskie aforizmy' (1910), published and unpublished extracts printed in V. V. Rozanov, Uedinennoe, comp. E. V. Barabanov, Moscow, 1990, pp. 669-72(671). Sukach argues that it was the phenomenon of Rozanov's life that was most important, because least known, to him: 'о себе Розанов никогда не писал, стыдился писать, а вот о феномене своего «Я» он всегда писал, не уставал писать, потому что это «Я» было всего более известно ему, более того - всего более неизвестно ему, и поэтому всего более интересно ему'. (V. Sukach, 'O V. V. Rozanove' (interview), Nachala, 1991, 1, p. 34.
112. 'Literaturnye i politicheskie aforizmy', p. 672.
113. 'Mimoletnoe' V. V. Rozanova' (1914-1916, unpublished), pub. Iu. Terapiano, Novyi zhurnal, 92, 1968, pp. 119-30(121).
114. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 95-96.
115. Reference is from the proofs of O. F. M. Dostoevskom i grafe L. N. Tolstom, p. 496, forthcoming in the series, Sochineniia Vasil'ia Vasil'evicha Rozanova, edited by V. G. Sukach.
116. 'Iz zapisei 1970-1971 godov', pp. 350-51.
117. 'Zametki', p. 510.
118. 'Perepiska V. V. Rozanova i M. O. Gershenzona', pp. 232-33.
119. Legenda o velikom inkvizitore, p. 74.
120. 'O Dostoevskom', p. 171.
121. 'O pisateliakh i pisatel'stve', p. 233.
122. Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 116, n.3.
123. Dialektika mifa, pp. 75-76.
124. See Rozanov's references to Vengerov and Kareev, in Smert.: 135, and Lit. izg.: 257, n.1.
125. See Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 48-49 on Merezhkovskii, pp. 225-26 on Merezhkovskii and Solov'ev. Berdiaev saw this value for physicality as a limitation in Rozanov's thinking. He wrote: 'Розанов мыслил не логически, а физиологически' (Samopoznanie, p. 149).
126. '«Хочется почесаться...» <...> И все теории разбиваются об этот физиологический факт, физиологический и вместе психологический, об этот, наконец, универсально-метафизический факт человеческой природы, человеческого душеустройства и даже историко-строения.' ('Oдна iz

- zamechatel'nykh idei F. M. Dostoevskogo', p. 55).
127. 'O pisateliakh i pisatel'stve', pp. 231-32.
128. 'Nechto o Logose', p. 90.
129. 'O pisateliakh i pisatel'stve', p. 233.
130. 'Zhenshchina pered velikoiu zadacheiu', pp. 230-31.
131. V. V. Rozanov, 'Gde istinnyi istochnik "bor'by veka"? (1895), Religiia i kul'tura, pp. 153-62(158).
132. Zinaida Gippius, 'Dekadenstvo i obshchestvennost', in her Literaturnyi dnevniki. 1899 - 1907, Munich, 1970 (reprint of St Petersburg, 1908 edition), pp. 327-46(334).
133. Posle Sakharny, p. 108.
134. 'Kto istinnyi vinovnik etogo?', pp. 654-55.
135. 'Psikhologiya russkogo raskola', p. 62. See also Rozanov's account of his proposals for newly married couples to spend their first nights in church (O. l. I: 184-87). Rozanov, whose first marriage was a disaster, and who was never allowed to conclude an official church marriage with the woman he loved, wrote with immense respect and understanding of the importance and complexity of this union. Yet he was forced to live his own family life 'around the Church walls', the title of his two volume book Okolo tserkovnykh sten, containing articles on religious and ecclesiastical questions dedicated to his 'friend-wife'.
136. M. M. Bakhtin, 'K pererabotke knigi o Dostoevskom', Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 308-27(326).
137. 'Zametki', p. 515. Clark and Holquist note the shared emphasis in the writing of Bakhtin and Florenskii, Rozanov's close associate, on the importance of love in breaking with a solipsistic self-centredness (see Mikhail Bakhtin, p. 136). Gary Saul Morson has recently emphasized the importance of love in Bakhtin's work, in his article, 'Prosaic Bakhtin: Landmarks, Anti-Intelligentsialism, and the Russian Countertradition', in Bakhtin in Contexts, ed. Amy Mandelker, Evanston, Illinois, 1995, pp. 33-78(37,71).
138. 'K pererabotke knigi o Dostoevskom', p. 317.
139. 'Kontseptsia lichnosti', p. 69. Nadezhda Mandel'shtam writes in a Bakhtinian spirit on the need for a shared culture for the realization of true character (lichnost'). The life of a culture depends on the maintenance of a true individuality that is engaged with the existences of others. It is dependent on the receptive values of others for its full expression: 'Личность связана с миром, с



людьми. Она находит себя среди себе подобных и, сознавая свою неповторимость, видит эту неповторимость в каждом.' (Vtoraia kniga, p. 13).

140. 'Kontseptsia lichnosti', p. 73.

141. 'Tri momenta v razvitii russkoi kritiki', p. 169.

142. O ponimanii, Moscow, 1886, recently republished with a commentary by Viktor Sukach, Moscow, 1996.

143. V. V. Rozanov. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo, p. 12.

144. Quoted in V. V. Rozanov. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo, p. 12. See also pp. 12-16.

145. Letter to Leont'ev, III, undated, 1891, Sochineniia, pp. 473-78(477).

146. Sukach sees this idea as central to Rozanov's writing: 'Розанов - весь в потенциальности' (O sebe i zhizni svoei, p. 24).

147. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 116-17.

148. 'Dary Tserery (Shekhiny)', p. 148.

149. 'Embriony', pp. 289-90.

150. 'Gde istinnyi istochnik "bor'by veka"?' , pp. 156-57.

151. 'Gde istinnyi istochnik "bor'by veka"?' , p. 158.

152. V. V. Rozanov, 'Universitet i nauka', Novyi put', 1903, 2, pp. 210-214(210).

153. K. V. Mochul'skii, 'Zametki o Rozanove', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 388-400(391).

154. V. V. Rozanov, 'Deti solntsa... kak oni byli prekrasny!...' (1903), Semeinyi vopros v Rossii, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1903, II, pp. 484-516. See also Rozanov's reference to 'Son smeshnogo cheloveka' in 'Iz zagadok chelovecheskoi prirody', pp. 36-39.

155. V. V. Rozanov, 'Smert'... i chto za neiu', in Al'manakh "Smert'", publication of Novyi zhurnal dlia vsekh, St Petersburg, 1910, pp. 243-63(260).

156. 'Iz zapisei 1970-1971 godov', p. 341.

157. 'Dekadenty', p. 440.

### NOTES TO CHAPTER III

1. 'O simvolistakh', pp. 320-321.
2. Dnevnik pisatel'ia za 1873 god, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, XXI, p. 7.
3. 'O Dostoevskom', p. 174.
4. 'Problema rechevykh zhanrov', p. 279.
5. 'Problema rechevykh zhanrov', p. 275.
6. Strakhov himself referred to this form of self-censorship: 'писатель у нас связан по рукам и по ногам; что бы он ни сказал, его тянут или в одну или в другую сторону и не дают ему остаться самим собою. <...> Писатели <...> предпочитают оставлять в тени самые существенные свои взгляды, и по внешнему виду нашей литературы, можно подумать, что ее вовсе не занимают основные вопросы богословия, философии, политики.' (N. N. Strakhov, foreword to his Iz istorii literaturnogo nigilizma, pp. vii-xii(xii)).
7. Letter to Leont'ev, III, undated, 1891, Sochineniia, pp. 473-78(473).
8. 'Literatura kak okhrannaia gramota', p. 185.
9. Letter to Leont'ev, I, undated, 1891, Sochineniia, pp. 466-69(466).
10. Viktor Erofeev sees this as the real reason for Rozanov's formal disclaiming of a reader: 'Нелюбовь Розанова к читателю имеет, скорее, не литературную, а идейную подоплеку. Для него российский читатель-современник как собирательное лицо представляет собою продукт того литературного воспитания и того устоявшегося общественного мнения, которые ему глубоко антипатичны.' (V. V. Erofeev, 'Raznotsvetnaia mozaika rozanovskoi mysli', introduction to V. V. Rozanov, Nesovmestimye kontrasty zhitii, pp. 6-36(16-17)).
11. V. V. Rozanov, 'Kritik russkogo *décadence*'a' (1909), pub. V. Sukach, Voprosy literatury, 1993, 2, pp. 210-219(212).
12. V. V. Rozanov, 'Neotsenimyi um' (1911), pub. S. Bocharov and V. Sukach, Opyty. Literaturno-filosofskii sbornik, ed. S. S. Averintsev et al., comp. A. V. Gulyga, Moscow, 1990, pp. 326-34(326-27). Rozanov recognized the immense potential of the new readership, if only it read with the right thoughtfulness: 'Боже! если бы стотысячная, пожалуй, даже миллионная толпа «читающих» теперь людей в

России с таким же вниманием, жаром, страстью прочитала и продумала из страницы в страницу Толстого и Достоевского, - задумалась бы над каждым их рассуждением и каждым художественным штрихом, - как это она сделала с каждой страницей Горького и Л. Андреева, то общество наше выросло бы уже теперь в страшную серьезную величину.' [О. 1. II: 339]

13. Foreward to Iz istorii literaturnogo nigilizma, pp. xi-xii.

14. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 302-03. Rozanov himself experienced this intimacy when reading Dostoevskii. In the same passage from Mimoletnoe, he described a sort of union of his soul with Dostoevskii's, similar to how he expressed his hopes for the effect of his own writing on his readers: 'Мордвинова (курсистка, переписка со мною) гениально воскликнула: «Он - мой» и ничего не прибавила. Я чувствовал это еще интимнее: «Он - я». <...> я чувствовал, как бы пишу это я сам, до какой степени «Достоевский писал мою душу».' (Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 303).

15. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 303-04.

16. 'Problema rechevykh zhanrov', pp. 277-78.

17. 'Raznotsvetnaia mozaika rozanovskoi mysli', p. 17.

18. 'Rozanov', pp. 326-29.

19. Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo, p. 270.

20. Segal emphasizes this important distinction between Dostoevskii and Rozanov; see 'Literatura kak okhrannaia gramota', pp. 182-3: 'От Достоевского, в частности, идет мифологизирующее представление об огромной реальной программирующей силе русской литературы, <...> о равнозначности слова и дела, о равноценности переворота в одной душе и переворота в мире и о прямой ответственности литературы за этот переворот. <...> Проза В. В. Розанов решает как раз все те вопросы, которые в «Дневнике писателя» Достоевский оставил за бортом. Проза Розанова <...> вещь сугубо частная, бытовая и одновременно вещь, ставящая преимущественно задачи художественно-эстетические - писательские.'

21. I. F. Romanov-Rtsy, 'Zametki na poliakh', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 16-24(16).

22. Letter to A. S. Glinka (Volzhskii), 16 February 1916, Uedinennoe, pp. 640-41(641).

23. 'Problema rechevykh zhanrov', p. 278.

24. 'Religiia - kak svet i radost'', pp. 3-4.

25. V. V. Rozanov, 'Sviatoe chudo bytiia' (1900), Semeinyi vopros v Rossii, II, pp. 44-60(44).
26. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 305-06(306).
27. Letter to A. S. Glinka (Volzhskii), Uedinennoe, p. 641.
28. Stephen Hutchings sees this as an example of what Lotman describes as 'autocommunication', notes only comprehensible to the self, in 'Breaking the Circle of the Self: Domestication, Alienation and the Question of Discourse Type in Rozanov's Late Writings', Slavic Review, 52, 1993, 1, pp. 67-86(73). He cites Iurii Lotman, Universe of the Mind: A Semiotic Theory of Culture, Bloomington and Indianapolis, 1990, pp. 20-35.
29. 'O Dostoevskom', pp. 170-171.
30. 'Literatura kak okhrannaia gramota', p. 177.
31. See Apok., pp. 625-26.
32. Okolo tserkovnykh sten, II, p. ix.
33. V. V. Rozanov, 'Nashi vozliublennye usopshie' (1900), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, I, pp. 94-109(105-06).
34. 'Literaturnye i politicheskie aforizmy', pp. 669-70.
35. 'Literaturnye i politicheskie aforizmy', pp. 670-71.
36. Osip Mandel'shtam, 'O sobesednike', Sobranie sochinenii, II, p. 233-40(236-37).
37. 'O sobesednike', p. 240.
38. 'O sobesednike', p. 240.
39. 'Problema teksta', p. 305.
40. 'Problema teksta', p. 305.
41. See Vtoraia kniga, pp. 26-31.
42. See 'R.-M. Ril'ke i A. N. Benua. Perepiska 1900-1902 gg.', pub. K. M. Azadovskii, Pamiatniki kul'tury: Novye otkrytiia. 1976, Moscow, 1977, pp. 75-105, in particular Benois' letter of 28 June 1901, pp. 91-92(91): 'Розанов <...> является истинно русским философом, корни которого уходят глубоко в народную стихию. <...> Он вышел из Достоевского, но во многом отошел от него и для уразумения нашего народного духа - безусловно необходимо знать как того, так и этого. Форма Розанова - сбитая, часто бестолковая и крайне небрежная. <...> Труд его переводить, я думаю, огромный, но он стоит этого труда. Если б Вы пожелали, то я постарался б Вам выслать несколько его

сочинений.'

43. Letter to A. N. Benois, 28 July 1901, pub. K. M. Azadovskii and L. N. Chertkova, in R. M. Ril'ke, Vorpsvede. Ogiust Roden. Pis'ma. Stikhi, ed. Iu. Kashkarov, Moscow, 1971, pp. 174-82(177). For more on Rilke's interest in Russia, see 'Raine Maria Ril'ke. Pis'ma v Rossi'u', pub. K. M. Azadovskii, Voprosy literatury, 1975, 9, pp. 215-42; Anna A. Tavis, Rilke's Russia. A Cultural Encounter, Evanston, Illinois, 1994; and Rilke's own stories, influenced by his experience of Russia, Rainer Maria Rilke, Stories of God, London, 1932.

44. Letter to Benois, 1901, p. 177.

45. Letter to Benois, 1901, p. 177.

46. Letter to Benois, 1901, p. 179.

NOTES TO CHAPTER IV

1. 'O pis'makh pisatelei', p. 433.
2. See O sebe i zhizni svoei, p. 496 and p. 777, n. 181, for Rozanov's proposed further publications of correspondence under the title Literaturnye izgnanniki.
3. Leont'ev's letters were originally published as 'Iz perepiski K. N. Leont'eva', Russkii vestnik, 1903, 4, pp. 633-52, 5, pp. 155-82, 6, pp. 409-38. They were republished as Konstantin Leont'ev, Pis'ma k Vasiliu Rozanovu, London, 1981. The edition of Strakhov and Govorukha-Otrok's letters was published as Literaturnye izgnanniki, originally in St Petersburg, 1913, reprinted in London, 1992. Suvorin's letters were published as Pis'ma A. S. Suvorina k V. V. Rozanovu, St Petersburg, 1913, and republished as V. V. Rozanov, Iz pripominanii i myslei ob A. S. Suvorine, Moscow, 1992. All editions contain essays, commentary and footnotes by Rozanov.
4. As well as the collections of letters cited, Rozanov also published letters from unknown correspondents and from priests, for example those from Ust'inskii and Filevskii, in Novyi put': see 'Iz pisem drugov i nedrugov', Novyi put', 1903, 2, pp. 142-52, and 4, pp. 116-134; see also Ued.: 43-44, 121, and O sebe i zhizni svoei, p. 723, n. 22. He used these letters from priests to further his own debate on his most valued theme of the Church's attitude to motherhood, families and their unspoken centre, sex.
5. See L. N. Tolstoi i Russkaia Tserkov', p. 367.
6. 'O pis'makh pisatelei', p. 432.
7. 'Neizvestnyi Rozanov' (Interview), pp. 33-34. See also O sebe i zhizni svoei, p. 750, n. 118 for reference to the use of footnotes as a literary device throughout Rozanov's work.
8. Tat'iana Pomeranskaia, 'Vsego lish' nepolnyi god...', introductory article to the publication of Rozanov's letters to Leont'ev, in Literaturnaia ucheba, 1989, 6, pp. 125-26 (126).
9. Rozanov anticipated this genre in the title of an early collection of aphorisms, 'Zametki na poliaakh neprochitannoi knigi', in Severnye tsvety na 1901 god, Moscow, 1901, pp. 169-79.
10. V. V. Rozanov, 'Iz starykh pisem. Pis'ma Vlad. Serg. Solov'eva', Voprosy zhizni, 1905, 10-11, pp. 377-90 (377).
11. 'Iz starykh pisem', p. 378.

12. 'Ot avtora', introduction to 'V svoem uglu', Novyi put', 1903, 2, pp. 135-36.

13. V. V. Rozanov, 'O vere russkikh' (1906, unpublished), Russkaia literatura, 1991, 1, pp. 111-23(111). The collection was published in 1907 in France as Le Tzar et la révolution, without Rozanov's article. For the history of this publication (and non-publication), and the negotiations surrounding it, see the introductory article by M. M. Pavlova in Russkaia literatura, 1991, 1, pp. 104-110.

14. Letter to Gershenzon, beginning of May 1909, 'Perepiska V. V. Rozanova i M. O. Gershenzona', p. 219.

15. See O. l. II, pp. 448-52.

16. V. V. Rozanov, 'Golosa iz provintsii o missionerstve' (1901-03), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, I, pp. 192-214(192-93).

17. 'Golosa iz provintsii o missionerstve', pp. 206-13(213).

18. V. V. Rozanov, 'Dva stana' (1906), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, I, pp. 388-403(389).

19. 'Dva stana', p. 396.

20. 'Dva stana', p. 389.

21. V. V. Rozanov, Voina 1914 goda i russkoe vozrozhdenie, Petrograd, 1915, pp. 204-06(205-6, n.1).

22. 'O pis'makh pisatelei', p. 431.

23. Siniavskii, "Opavshie List'ia", p. 119.

24. Mandel'shtam compares the situation of a writer seeking a true understanding in the future to the impulse for letter writing in his essay 'O sobesednike', p. 240.

25. Letter to Briusov, 20 October 1901, Mysli o literature, p. 509.

26. V. V. Rozanov, Pered Sakharnoi (1913, unpublished), Religiia. Filosofii. Kul'tura, comp. A. N. Nikoliukin, Moscow, 1992, pp. 314-42(327).

27. Pered Sakharnoi, pp. 326-27.

28. Pered Sakharnoi, p. 337.

29. Pered Sakharnoi, p. 336.

30. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 149.

31. V. V. Rozanov, 'Neuznannyi fenomen...' (1903), Sochineniia, pp. 203-15(207).

32. N. F. Fedorov, 'O pis'menakh. Posmertnaia stat'ia', Nashe Nasledie, 1989, 6, pp. 117-18(117).

33. 'O pisateliakh i pisatel'stve', p. 241.

34. 'O pisateliakh i pisatel'stve', p. 241.

35. 'O pis'menakh', p. 117.

36. Siniavskii, "Opavshie List'ia", p. 119.

37. V. V. Rozanov, V Sakharne (1913, unpublished), Religiia. Filosofiia. Kul'tura, pp. 343-56(347).

38. V. V. Rozanov, 'Pechatanie sittsev', Letopisets, 1904, 1, pp. 5-7(6-7).

39. 'O pis'menakh', p. 118.

40. The impact of technological advances on man's spiritual or psychological life is recurrent in Rozanov's arguments and imagery. In 'Russkii Nil', Rozanov discusses the destructive influence of railways on the contemporary psyche, that cannot be escaped even in the country ('Russkii Nil', pp. 338-39). Yet he also remarks that railway journeys are stimulating to thought, 'Больше всего приходит мыслей в конке. Конку трясет, меня трясет, мозг трясется и из мозга вытрясаются мысли. (в конке)' [O. 1. II: 559]. The opavshie list'ia bears witness to such fragmentary, transient thoughts, often with a noting 'y vagone' or with the name of the particular train or tram line. Rozanov used this image of urban fragmentation in the description of his works: 'Вывороченные шпалы. Шашки. Песок. Камень. Рывины. - Что это? - ремонт мостовой? - Нет, это «Сочинения Розанова». И по железным рельсам несется уверенно трамвай. (на Невском, ремонт)' [O. 1. I: 179]. Stephen Baehr has studied the incursion of this industrial and technological imagery into Russian literature. He claims: 'During the nineteenth century, the introduction of machines into Russia had a major impact on the literary portrayal of time and space, speed, morality, and man's growing relationship to his fellows and his surroundings.' (Stephen L. Baehr, 'The Troika and the Train: Dialogues Between Tradition and Technology in Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature', in Issues in Russian Literature Before 1917, ed. J. Douglas Clayton, Columbus, Ohio, 1989, pp. 85-106(87)). Rozanov both spoke of this change, in his constant railing against print technology ending love and physical contact, and embodied it in his writing, in his own transformations of literary time and space.



41. Siniavskii, "Opavshie List'ia", p. 122. See also O. l. I: 249-51, where Rozanov compares his 'rukopisnost' dushi' with a smoking hot ember from the fire, which God holds between tongs that cannot be seen for the smoke. The images of hot and cold are a constant contrast in Rozanov's writing: warmth is linked with words and impulses that are intimate, spontaneous, containing the immediate heat of emotion. Its centre is the family, 'мы ищем именно семьи, ее теплоты, ее прекрасной и истинно мистической теплоты' ('Nechto iz sedoi drevnosti', p. 263). These words are the source of life and renewal, in contrast to the coldness of all forms of system, scholasticism, Godlessness and the dead words and phrases of official and artificial language that contribute to the distancing and 'freezing-up' of relations between people symptomatic of the approach of the apocalypse (see, for example Lit. izg.: 490-91; Rozanov's letter to Leont'ev, III, undated, Sochineniia, pp. 473-78(474); Posle Sakharny, p. 98). Gippius claimed that Rozanov had an 'organic' fear of physical cold. ('Zadumchivyi strannik', p. 41). In his late writing Rozanov repeatedly notes his horror at a universal cold with exclamations and printed shivers. He saw his task in writing as restoring the lost warmth to words and life. In Apokalipsis nashego vremeni, Rozanov saw this internal heat as the source of the constant strength of the Jews, in contrast to a bloodless and impotent Christianity. He declared that he must undertake his own writing in this Judaic spirit: 'оттого они и живут и не могут, и не хотят умереть, что - горячи. И будь, жид, горяч. О, как Розанов, - и не засыпай, и не холодей вечно. Если ты задремлешь - мир умрет.' [Апок.: 615]

42. Letter to Leont'ev, III, undated, 1891, Sochineniia, pp. 473-78(474).

43. Posle Sakharny, pp. 97-98.

44. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 263.

45. Marietta Chudakova argues that Rozanov's battle with modernity in the form of print had radically modern stylistic consequences: 'Вся жизнь его пошла на борьбу с «Гуттенбергом», с литературой, как бы составленной из печатных литер. <...> Он стирал черту отделяющую рукописное - как легшее в архив и лишь оттуда поднимающееся на поверхность печатной жизни - от печатного, стирал временную дистанцию, культурную паузу, традиционно отбиваемый культурой интервал между писанным для частного применения (письмо, дневник) и для печати, для всех. В этом и был смысл произведенной им литературной революции. Он пошел в ней дальше футуристов.' ('Plyvushchii korabl'', Novyi mir, 1989, 7, pp. 231-35(235)). The article by Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, 'A New Word for a New Myth: Nietzsche and Russian Futurism', in The European Foundations of Russian Modernism, ed. Peter I. Barta and Ulrich Goebel, Lewiston, New York, 1991, pp. 219-50, emphasizes the legacy of Belyi

and Ivanov (but not of Rozanov), in the bid to transcend the limits of the printed page, rational intellect, and the isolation of the reader (p. 228). Rosenthal discusses changes in an attitude to the word which directly parallel Rozanov's activity. She writes of the futurist need to "overcome Gutenberg" (p. 245), indirectly quoting Rozanov, and discusses the futurist emphasis on handwritten documents and rejection of "frozen" language (p. 246), also a constant concern of Rozanov's.

46. 'Dekadenty', pp. 438-41.

47. Letter to Pertsov, II, November 1896, Sochineniia, pp. 489-91(490).

48. See also the attack on the censorship of 1912: V. V. Rozanov, 'Istoriko-literaturnyi rod Kireevskikh', Novoe vremia, 18 October 1912, extract published in O sebe i zhizni svoei, pp. 768-69, n.80.

49. Shklovskii, 'Rozanov', p. 336.

50. Letter to Izmailov, 30 August 1911, 'Pis'ma V. Rozanova k A. Izmailovu', Novyi zhurnal, 136, 1979, pp. 121-26(121-22).

51. A. Belyi, 'Pravda o russkoi intelligentsii. Po povodu sbornika Vekhi', Vesy, 1909, 5, pp. 65-68(68).

52. Iz pripominanii i myslei ob A. S. Suvorine, (see note 3, above).

53. Iz pripominanii, pp. 55-56.

54. V. I. Lenin, 'Vnutrennee obozrenie' (originally published in Zaria, 1901, 2-3), Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 55 vols, Moscow, 1958-65, 5, 1959, pp. 295-347(336).

55. V. I. Lenin, 'Karer'a' (originally published in Pravda, 1912), Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 22, 1961, pp. 43-44(44).

56. Maksim Gor'kii, letter to V. V. Rozanov, November 4 1905, in Letopis' zhizni i tvorchestva A. M. Gorkogo, ed. B. V. Mikhailovskii et al., 4 vols, Moscow, 1958-1960, I, 1958, pp. 559-60.

57. Letter to Gor'kii, after 4 November 1905, Mysli o literature, pp. 511-15(514-15).

58. Rozanov claimed that this was at the demand of Merezhkovskii and Filosofov, who claimed that Rozanov's presence would compromise them; see O. l. I: 254, O. L. II: 497. Blok was enlisted in part as replacement, although by 1913 Blok was himself threatened with exclusion; see Charles A. Ruud, Russian entrepreneur. Publisher Ivan Sytin of Moscow, 1851-1934, Montreal and Kingston, 1990, pp. 130-

33.

59. A document that illustrates well the complexities of Rozanov's attitude to Judaism is 'Perepiska V. V. Rozanova i M. O. Gershenzona'.

60. Iz pripominanii, p. 49.

61. Iz pripominanii, p. 13.

62. Iz pripominanii, p. 43.

63. Iz pripominanii, p. 42.

64. Posle Sakharny, p. 114.

65. Posle Sakharny, p. 114.

66. V. V. Rozanov, 'Tsenzura' (1916), Mysli o literature, pp. 497-500(500).

67. 'Tsenzura', p. 500.

68. Letter to Suvorin, end of May 1904, Mysli o literature, pp. 510-11(510).

69. Rozanov made the comparison between reading and eating early on in his career. In Sumerki prosveshcheniia, he described talentless readers and writers, 'он не имеет обоняния, у него нет вкуса, и вот отчего он так обильно и постоянно «ест» - мы хотим сказать: постоянно и обильно узнает.' (V. V. Rozanov, Sumerki prosveshcheniia (1899), in his Sumerki prosveshcheniia, ed. V. N. Shcherbakov, Moscow, 1990, pp. 3-254(241)). In his 1914 Mimoletnoe he repeats this idea: 'Чтение и сила и напряженность его есть особый талант - талант умственного поедания, талант душевного аппетита, «охоты к еде книг». Собственно, только эти люди и составляют «образованный класс страны».' ('Neizdannye "Opavshie list'ia" ("Mimoletnoe") V. V. Rozanova' (1914), pub. V. G. Sukach, Kontekst, 1989, pp. 172-228(210)).

70. Footnote to letter from Leontev 19 June 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 93, n.3.

71. Posle Sakharny, p. 110.

72. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 306.

73. 'Neizdannye "Opavshie list'ia"', p. 203.

NOTES TO CHAPTER V

1. Posle Sakharny, p. 108.
2. Avril Pyman, A History of Russian Symbolism, Cambridge, 1994, p. 139.
3. Letter to Leont'ev, IV, end of May - beginning of June 1891, Sochineniia, pp. 478-79(479).
4. Iu. N. Govorukha-Otrok, 'Zametki o progresse i tsivilizatsii', Russkoe obozrenie, 1897, 1, pp. 89-96, and 2, pp. 740-49.
5. 'Zametki o progresse i tsivilizatsii', p. 741.
6. N. P. Giliarov-Platonov, Otkuda nigilizm?, Moscow, 1904, p. 7.
7. See V. V. Rozanov 'Revoliutsionnaia oblomovka' (1917), and 'Rassypavshiesia Chichikovy' (1917-18, unpublished), in Religiia. Filosofiia. Kul'tura, pp. 357-63 and 367 respectively; and V. V. Rozanov, 'Tainstvennye otnosheniia' (1918), Sochineniia, pp. 445-47, and 'S vershiny tysiacheletnei piramidy'.
8. 'Zametki o progresse i tsivilizatsii', p. 95.
9. 'Zametki o progresse i tsivilizatsii', p. 89.
10. Giliarov-Platonov, Otkuda nigilizm?, p.16.
11. 'Ogni sviashchennye', pp. 3-4.
12. 'Zametki o progresse i tsivilizatsii', p.88. Rozanov's original title for the pamphlets that formed Apokalipsis nashego vremeni was 'Troitskie berezki', referring to this same popular custom of decorating trees, see O sebe i zhizni svoei, p. 784.
13. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', pp. 205-06.
14. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 262.
15. Letter to Gor'kii, 3-6 March 1912, Mysli o literature, pp. 521-22(521).
16. V. V. Rozanov, 'O delikatnosti i prochikh melochakh' (1910), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., pp. 631-37(633).
17. A History of Russian Literature, pp. 324-25.

18. In a note by Rozanov, beginning the collection of 90 letters from Strakhov to Rozanov, Otdel Rukopisei Rossiskoi Gosudarstvennoi Biblioteki, F. 249, M 3820, karton 1, l. 1.: 'об этих горьких временах приходится вспоминать как о эпохах гонений на христианство Диоклетиана <...> а на Страхову я не могу смотреть иначе, как на одного из преображаемых христианских мучеников; христианских и философских...'. Rozanov used a similar image in the second book of Opavshie list'ia, where he cites the phrase with which gladiators going to probable death saluted the emperor, as that which should be spoken by literary exiles such as Strakhov and Govorukha-Otrok: 'Поистине прогресс наш может быть встречен словами: «Morituri te salutant», - из уст философов, поэтов, одиночек-мыслителей.' [O. l. II: 338]

19. Posle Sakharu, p. 101.

20. See O sebe i zhizni svoei, p. 746, n. 72, on Rtsy: 'Иван Федорович Романов, неудачник-писатель, прятаявший свое лицо (но не свою душу) под псевдонимом «РЦЫ»», «Гатчинский отшельник», «Заточников» (и м. б. другими)... '.

21. S. F. Sharapov, Neopoznannyi genii, Moscow, 1903.

22. See O sebe i zhizni svoei, O. l. II: 496, and p. 777, n. 181.

23. Mimoletnoe (1915), p.324.

24. O sebe i zhizni svoei, p.777, n. 181.

25. 'Pamiati usopshikh', p. 227; this republication of an article from Literaturnye ocherki (1899) combined two separate memoirs, on Shperk and Govorukha-Otrok, the article on Shperk was first published in Novoe vremia, no. 7769, 1897.

26. 'Pamiati usopshikh', p.225.

27. 'Novye embriony', p. 296. Rozanov also cites the case of Moses, who was an unparalleled writer, but could not speak; all the energy of his words was concentrated in his spirit, not allowing physical utterance ('Embriony', p. 295).

28. 'O pisateliakh i pisatel'stve', p. 242.

29. 'Rtsy' was a pseudonym that Rozanov claimed demonstrated love for Orthodoxy, since it came from the Old Church Slavonic, for 'to speak' ('reshchi', 'rtsy', 'rtsem'). See O sebe i zhizni svoei, O. l. I: 186, and p. 740, n.26.

30. See O sebe i zhizni svoei, p. 746, n. 72.

31. Florenskii is not chosen because he was, as Rozanov recognized, 'a particular man', and while sharing many of the values mentioned, stood apart.

32. 'Pis'ma I. F. Romanova (Rtsy) k V. V. Rozanovu', Novyi zhurnal, 159, 1985, pp. 154-95(154). Hereafter 'Rtsy. Pis'ma'.

33. Ued.: 109-110.

34. O. l. I: 300, 499.

35. O. l. II: 518.

36. See letter II, 29-30 September 1895, 'Rtsy. Pis'ma', pp. 161-65(164): 'Затем цензура. Что можно сказать при существующей системе правительственного нигилизма, при господствующем в официальных сферах фаворитизме? <....> Подумайте, о чем и как говорить при таком убийственном духоугашении? Только хрюкать с подлыми льстецами и возможно...' The passage anticipates Rozanov's frequent outbursts in Opavshie list'ia and in footnotes to Literaturnye izgnanniki.

37. See letter V, 3 April 1892, 'Rtsy. Pis'ma', pp. 171-79(173).

38. See letter VIII, 7 May 1892, 'Rtsy. Pis'ma', pp. 189-95(194): 'Самая лютая злоба на бумаге менее зла, чем только неласковое слово на деле. Я груб порою до цинизма, но опять на бумаге, а в жизни меня шокирует нескромность речи.'

39. See letter II, 'Rtsy. Pis'ma', pp. 163-65.

40. Letter II, 'Rtsy. Pis'ma', p. 161.

41. I. F. Romanov, Listopad, Kiev, 1892; see letter II, 'Rtsy. Pis'ma', pp. 164-65.

42. The title also anticipates Rozanov's intended collective title for his opavshie list'ia genre, 'Listva' (see Rozanov's plan of 1917 for his collected works, Religiia. Filosofiiia. Kul'tura, p. 368).

43. Letopisets, 1904, 1, pp. 3-4(3). Rtsy emphasizes the importance of the 'heart' over rational intellect in his letter to Rozanov, VI, undated, 'Rtsy. Pis'ma', pp. 179-85(181).

44. 'Iz perepiski s N. G. Giliarovym-Platonovym', Letopisets, 1904, 1, pp. 63-64, 3-4, pp. 137-43, 9, pp. 297-302, 10, pp. 345-49, and 12, pp. 407-13. See also 'Iz pis'ma Iv. F. Romanova k N. P. Giliarovu-Platonovu', Letopisets, 1904, 12, pp. 413-19.

45. 'Iz perepiski s N. P. Giliarovym-Platonovym', p. 137.

46. 'Iz perepiski s N. P. Giliarovym-Platonovym', p.138.
47. I. F. Romanov, 'Byloe i dumy', Letopisets, 1904, 1, pp. 50-51(50).
48. Linda Gerstein, Nikolai Strakhov, Cambridge, Mass., 1971, p. 209.
49. Lit. izq.: 486.
50. See Lit. izq.: 11-12, n.1.
51. See Lit. izq.: 47-48.
52. 'Novye embriony', p. 306.
53. Rozanov particularly valued Strakhov's insistence that the organism is not a quantifiable and definable entity, but a process, in which the spiritual emerges from and is dependent on the physical conditions of its existence: 'Мы видим, что в этих простых и кратких словах содержится новая точка зрения на две великия области, органического и психического, связь которых представляется столь неуловимую.' [Lit. izq.: 22]
54. See Lit. izq.: 23.
55. See Lit. izq.: 10, n.1.
56. The article was originally published in Grot's Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii, 4, 1890, Spetsial'nyi otdel, pp. 27-64, and reprinted in Literaturnye izgnanniki, pp. 3-64.
57. See Lit. izq.: 62-63.
58. N. N. Strakhov, review, '"Legenda o velikom inkvizitore" F. M. Dostoevskogo. Opyt kriticheskogo kommentariia, V. Rozanova. Spb. 1894', in his Bor'ba s Zapadom v nashei literature, 3 vols, The Hague, 1969 (reprint of Kiev, 1898 edition), III, pp. 220-27(222).
59. Nikolai Strakhov, p. 84. However, Gerstein argues that Strakhov's use of literature in the defence of idealism was as utilitarian as Chernyshevskii's: see Nikolai Strakhov, pp. 80-81.
60. Strakhov, 'Tiazheloe vremia', p. 157.
61. See 'Eshche o peterburgskoi literature. Pis'mo k redaktoru "Vremeni" po povodu dvukh sovremennykh statei' (Vremia 1861), in his Iz istorii literaturnogo niqilizma, pp. 14-38(17): 'Среди хаоса и мрака нашей литературы, я всячески стараюсь отыскать хоть маленький клочек твердой почвы, на котором можно было крепко держаться'. Dostoevskii believed that Strakhov was the only real critic of the time, and wrote to Strakhov that he believed him to be the

only representative of the sort of literary criticism that belongs to the future (F. M. Dostoevskii, letter to Strakhov, 26 February 1869, Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, XXIX, kn. I, letter 362, pp. 14-22(17)).

62. N. N. Strakhov, 'Vozdushnye iavleniia', in his Bor'ba s Zapadom v nashei literature, II, pp. 145-71(168).

63. See Lit. izg.: 63. Gerstein shares Rozanov's view that Strakhov's talent was in an empathetic understanding of writers quite different to himself (Nikolai Strakhov, p. 219). She believes that this helped him to explore the full implications of intellectual systems that he did not himself believe in.

64. See Lit. izg.: 366, n.1.

65. Letter to Leont'ev, II, 20 May 1891, Sochineniia, pp. 469-73(470).

66. See Lit. izg.: 303, n.1.

67. See Lit. izg.: 247, n.1.

68. Letter to Tolstoi, 17 November 1879, in Perepiska L. N. Tolstogo s N. N. Strakhovym, St Petersburg, 1913, letter 127, pp. 238-41(240). See also letters 79, pp. 165-66(165), and 83, pp. 171-73(171).

69. Anna Dostoevskaiia quoted this passage from a footnote in her memoirs, claiming that it was on reading Rozanov's words that she understood the persistence of Dostoevskii's love for her, despite their differences: see A. G. Dostoevskaiia, Vospominaniia, Moscow, 1987, pp. 434-35. Anna Dostoevskaiia's correspondence with Rozanov has been partially published in Minuvshee, as 'Perepiska A. G. Dostoevskoi s V. V. Rozanovym', Minuvshee, 9, 1990, pp. 258-93.

70. See O. l. II: 342: 'Я переживал Леонтьева (К.) и еще отчасти Талмуд. <...>. Зачем «читал» другое - не знаю. Ничего нового и ничего поразительного.'

71. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', p. 205.

72. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', p. 204.

73. 'O pisateliakh i pisatel'stve', p. 244. See also the reference to Leont'ev in Smert.: 135-36.

74. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', p.205.

75. Rozanov expressed this as a general 'fading', 'все в мире линяет' [Lit. izg.: 10, n.1]; see also his article 'Pechatanie sittsev', p. 7. Rozanov uses the verb 'liniat' to describe the loss of vitality and individual character



that characterized his contemporary age.

76. See 'Pechatanie sittsev': p. 7, 'Душа скрылась из литературы: и работают какая-то «общия способности». Все индивидуальное, «мое», «не чужое» - меркнет! неудержимо!! Работать начинают в каждом именно «не его», а «чужия в нем» качества души. Посмотрите, как потупилось в каждом зрение, наблюдательность; даже интерес смотреть, взглянуть!'

77. Pis'mo k Pertsovu, XI, December 1897, Sochineniia, pp. 496-99(499).

78. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', p. 205.

79. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', p. 210.

80. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', p. 210.

81. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', p. 210.

82. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', pp. 205-06.

83. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', p. 206.

84. 'Pozdnie fazy slavianofil'stva', p. 201.

85. See Gershenzon's letter to Rozanov, 8 May 1909, 'Perepiska V. V. Rozanova i M. O. Gershenzona', p. 231.

86. Letter to Leont'ev, VII, 14 August 1891, Sochineniia, 481-487(483).

87. Letter to Leon'tev III, undated 1891, Sochineniia, pp. 473-78(474).

88. 'Zametki o progresse i tsivilizatsii', p. 744.

89. Letter to Leont'ev, I, April 1891, Sochineniia, p. 466.

90. 'Pozdnie fazy slavianofil'stva', p. 196.

91. Letter to Leont'ev, I, Sochineniia, p. 467.

92. Ivask, Konstantin Leont'ev, pp. 359-60.

93. Letter to Leont'ev, III, undated 1891, Sochineniia, p. 474.

94. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', p. 214.

95. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', p. 214.

96. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', p. 214.

97. V. V. Rozanov, 'Konstantin Leont'ev i ego "popechiteli"' (1919), pub. V. Konstantinov, Nachala, 1992, 2, pp. 88-91(89). Rozanov had anticipated this condemnation of Nietzsche, first published in 1919 in Novoe slovo, in a contradictory attack on Leont'ev in Opavshie list'ia: 'По этим мотивам «весь Леонтьев» в сущности, есть - «все одни разговоры» <...>. А «хороший разговор» не стоит пасхального кулича. Жил же Леонтьев и практически желал всего того, что «средний европеец» и «буржуа в пиджаке».' [O. l. II: 301-02]
98. 'Neotsenimyi um', pp. 329-30.
99. 'Konstantin Leont'ev i ego "popechiteli"', p. 89.
100. Letter to Rozanov, 13 June 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 80.
101. 'Tri momenta v razvitii russkoi kritiki', p. 155, footnote, and Rozanov's review of Leont'ev's book on Tolstoi in 'Neotsenimyi um', pp. 330-34.
102. Letter to Rozanov, 24 May 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p.60.
103. Letter to Rozanov, 24 May 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, pp.59-60, n.2.
104. Strakhov, in his letter to Rozanov, 16 October 1890, exclaimed: 'как верно Вы угадали <...> отсутствие в нем веры!' [Lit. izg.: 251]
105. 'Iz starykh pisem', p. 386.
106. Letter to Rozanov, 13 June 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 75.
107. Letter to Rozanov, 24 May 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, pp. 60-61.
108. See Lit. izg.: 122, n.1-2 and 119, n.1, also compare Rozanov's use of the image of flight in his description of ways of thinking, as discussed in Chapter II.
109. Konstantin Leont'ev, Vizantizm i slavianstvo, in his Vostok, Rossiia i slavianstvo, 2 vols, Osnabruck, 1966 (reprint of 1885-86 edition), I, pp. 79-189(88).
110. 'Neuznannyi fenomen...', p. 207.
111. Letter to Rozanov, 13 June 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 74.
112. Letter to Rozanov, 8 May 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, pp. 45-46: '<...> пока, чтобы удовлетворить вашему желанию видеть мое старое лицо, посылаю вам слишком черную,

неудачную фотографию; все-таки понять и по ней можно, какое у меня лицо. Смолоду я был хорош, а теперь слишком много морщин. Это почему-то физиологическое свойство у людей нашего класса иметь в старости много мелких морщин на лице... У мужиков, у монахов «из простых» и у людей белого духовенства этого нет... Их старость гораздо благообразнее. Морщины крупнее, кожа свежее нашей. Заметьте, это так.'

113. Footnote to Leont'ev's letter of 8 May 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 49, n.7.

114. Letter to Leont'ev, II, 20 May 1891 (reply to Leont'ev's letter of 8 May), Sochineniia, pp. 469-73(472).

115. 'Pozdnie fazy slavianofil'stva', p. 200.

116. See O. l. I: 314-20.

117. See Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 189-90; the passage begins, 'Грех, грех, грех в моих словах о Конст. Леонтьеве в «Оп. л.»'.

118. Mimoletnoe (1915), p.189.

119. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 189-90.

120. Rozanov points out the difference in their sense of religion by contrasting their approach to religious types in Dostoevskii's Brat'ia Karamazovy. Rozanov reacts to Leont'ev's criticism of Dostoevskii's fantastical 'harmonies' embodied in characters such as Zosima by insisting that even if Zosima's teaching is untrue to Orthodox monasticism it is no less spiritually important for Russia: '«И правда - не ваш,» - отвечаю я и беру Зосиму в охапку и выношу его, а с ним и все его богатство душевное - за стены тихих обителей.' (Footnote to letter from Leont'ev, 13 April 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 40, n. 4.)

121. 'Pozdnie fazy slavianofil'stva', pp.196-97.

122. V. V. Rozanov, 'Optina Pustyn'' (1903), Religiia. Filosofiia. Kul'tura, pp.263-80(275).

123. 'Konstantin Leont'ev i ego "popечители"', p.89.

124. See Vizantizm i slavianstvo, pp. 28-31.

125. See Rozanov's supremely and self-consciously 'bourgeois' declaration about his writing in Opavshie list'ia: 'Лучшее в моей литературной деятельности - что десять человек кормились около нее. Это определенное и твердое.' [O. l. II: 425]

126. V. V. Rozanov, 'Iz monastyr'ia domoi' (1913), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., pp. 612-20(616-17).

127. 'Pozdnie fazy slavianofil'stva', pp. 201-02.
128. 'Iz starykh pisem', p.386.
129. Footnote to Leont'ev's letter of 13 August 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, pp. 104-05, n.1.
130. Berdiaev also pointed out Leont'ev's prescient use of the term 'obshchepsikhicheskaja muzyka', that anticipates the language and ideas of the early twentieth century (Nikolai Berdiaev, Leont'ev, Paris, 1926, p.161).
131. Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 135.
132. Leont'ev, Pis'ma, pp. 129-37.
133. Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 132.
134. V. G. Sukach, 'K publikatsii stat'i V. V. Rozanova "Avtoportret Vl. S. Solov'eva"', Obshchestvennaia mysl', I, 1989, pp. 231-32(231).
135. 'Avtoportret Vl. S. Solov'eva', p. 245.
136. 'Zametka o vazhneishikh techeniakh', pp. 28-29.
137. V. V. Rozanov, 'Ob odnoi osobennoi zaslude Vl. S. Solov'eva' (1904), in Okolo tserkovnykh sten, II, pp. 367-83(369).
138. 'Ob odnoi osobennoi zaslude Vl. S. Solov'eva', p. 373.
139. 'Pamiati Vl. Solov'eva', p. 33.
140. Rozanov's phrase, 'семья связанных друг с другом людей' is echoed in Mandel'shtam's passage on Rozanov in 'O prirode slova' (p. 249), which was discussed in Chapter II.
141. Letter to Leont'ev, III, undated 1891, Sochineniia, pp. 473-78(475).
142. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 223.
143. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 224-5.
144. See V. V. Rozanov, 'Na panikhide po Vl. S. Solov'eva' (1901), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, I, pp. 239-42(239).
145. 'Na panikhide po Vl. S. Solov'eva', p. 241.
146. 'V poiskakh smysla', pp. 54-55, see also A. F. Losev, Vladimir Solov'ev i ego vremia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 663-670.
147. Letter to Rozanov, 24 May 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 57.

148. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 223.

149. Posle Sakharny, p. 95.

150. Posle Sakharny, p. 101.

151. 'Avtoportret Vl. S. Solov'eva', p. 234. Averintsev has written about the connection between jokes and the devil in Russian culture, and notes the use of the word 'shut', as a popular word for the devil. See Sergei Averintsev, 'Bakhtin, smekh, khristianskaia kul'tura', in M. M. Bakhtin kak filosof, ed. S. S. Averintsev, Iu. N. Davydov, V. N. Trubin et al., Moscow, 1992, pp. 7-19, and 'Bakhtin and the Russian attitude to laughter', in Bakhtin, Carnival and Other Subjects, ed. David Shepherd, Critical Studies, 3, 2 - 4, 1\2, Amsterdam and Atlanta, 1993, pp.13-19(13-15).

152. V. V. Rozanov, 'Sredi obmanutykh i obmanuvshikh', Novyi put', 1904, 7, pp. 90-124(101).

153. Belyi also recognized this effect of Solov'ev's laugh in a letter to Florenskii, but denied that its demonic overtones had any basis in reality: 'смешок этот так и застыл на портретах его, заставляя подчас - и совершенно напрасно, видеть в Соловьеве нечто демоническое' (letter to Florenskii, 12 August 1904, 'Perepiska P. A. Florenskogo s Andreem Belym', comp. igumen Andronik (A. S. Trubachev) et al., Kontekst, 1991, pp. 23-61, 34-35(35)).

154. Letter to G. I. Chulkov, 23 June 1905, in Aleksandr Blok, Sobranie sochinenii, ed. V. N. Orlov et al., 8 vols, Moscow-Leningrad, 1960-63, VIII, 1963, letter 74, pp. 126-29(127).

155. 'Na panikhide po Vl. S. Solov'eva', p. 240. See also Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 224, on Solov'ev's sadness.

156. Losev commented: 'Никто не замечал грусти в смехе Вл. Соловьева. А вот Розанов заметил.' (Vladimir Solov'ev i ego vremia, p.666).

157. 'Avtoportret Vl. S. Solov'eva', p. 235.

158. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 226.

159. Solov'ev made several attacks on Rozanov in the ten years between the publication of Rozanov's 'Mesto khristianstva v istorii', which first drew Solov'ev's attention to him, and Solov'ev's death. Solov'ev's first attack on Rozanov was in the article 'Porfirii Gogolev o svobode i vere', Vestnik Evropy, 1894, 2, pp. 909-16 (republished in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 282-92). In 1899, Solov'ev launched a second attack on Rozanov together with Merezhkovskii and Minskii, accusing them of orgiastic intoxication, with overtones of demonism

and the Antichrist, in the articles, 'Osoboe chestvovanie Pushkina' and 'Protiv ispolnitel'nogo lista', (see V. S. Solov'ev, Filosofiia iskusstva i literaturnaia kritika, comp. R. Gal'tseva and I. Rodnianskaia, Moscow, 1991, pp. 300-10 and 310-16 respectively).

160. Letter to Rozanov, 7, undated, 1895, 'Pis'ma k V. V. Rozanovu', Pis'ma Vladmira Sergeevicha Solov'eva, ed. E. L. Radlov, 3 vols, St Petersburg, 1908-11, III, 1911, pp. 43-54(50).

161. Quoted in 'V poiskakh smysla', p. 55.

162. Vladimir Solov'ev i ego vremia, p. 515.

163. Vladimir Solov'ev i ego vremia, pp. 515-16.

164. 'Ob odnoi osobennoi zaslugе Vl. Solov'eva', p. 373.

165. 'Avtoportret Vl. S. Solov'eva', pp. 241-42.

166. Letter to Gor'kii, 'after 4 November 1905', Mysli o literature, pp. 511-15(512).

167. V. V. Rozanov, 'Sem'ia i zhizn'' (1897), Religiia i kul'tura, pp. 207-15(207).

168. '«Я бы обрадовался секте скопцов», - говорит Л-в в одном из приведенных писем.' (Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 131), 'В 1894 году, <...> покойный Ф. Э. Шперк передал мне, не без удивления, весьма сочувственные слова Соловьева о принципе оскопления, как радикального средства отвязаться от угнетающей нас «плоти».' (Leont'ev, Pis'ma, pp. 134-35).

169. Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 135.

170. Footnote to Leont'ev's letter of 13 June 1891, Leont'ev, Pis'ma, pp. 89-90.

171. 'Na panikhide po Vl. S. Solov'eva', pp. 241-42.

172. 'Avtoportret Vl. S. Solov'eva', p. 243.

173. Letter to Florenskii, 12 August 1904, 'Perepiska P. A. Florenskogo s Andreem Belym', p. 35.

174. Posle Sakharu, p. 95.

175. 'Avtoportret Vl. S. Solov'eva', p. 237.

176. Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 136.

# NOTES TO CHAPTER VI

1. Letter to Pertsov, XXV, September 1900, Sochineniia, pp. 510-12(510). In December of the same year Rozanov wrote an article entitled, 'Vsemirnaia skuka', identifying his own mood with a worldwide boredom, this was published in Kogda nachal'stvo ushlo... (1905-1906 g.g.), St Petersburg, 1910, pp. 3-13.
2. See Lit. izg.: 252, n.2.
3. Leont'ev and Solov'ev are even described as agents, as well as victims of this process: see Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 134.
4. Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore F. M. Dostoevskogo, first published in Russkii vestnik, 1891, 1, pp. 233-74, 2, pp. 226-64, 3, pp. 215-53, 4, pp. 251-75, recently published in Nesovmestimye kontrasty zhitiia, pp. 37-224; 'F. M. Dostoevskii. (Kritiko-biograficheskii ocherk)', first published as an introduction to the 'Niva' edition of Polnoe sobranie sochinenii F. M. Dostoevskogo, St Petersburg, 1894, then as 'O Dostoevskom' in Literaturnye ocherki, St Petersburg, 1899, and recently published in Sochineniia, pp. 170-82.
5. Rozanov claimed that Leont'ev would have found true intellectual sympathy in the new Dostoevskian atmosphere of the 1890s. He uses similar imagery to the quote on Govorukha-Otrok, characterizing the new mood as that of a student canteen: 'ну, ввести бы Леонтьева <...> в факультет Левиных, Раскольниковых. <...> В залу, или пожалуй, в студенческую «столовую» он вошел бы <...>. Он оборвал бы и был бы оборван (в речи), но понимаемый и понимая. Он заспорил бы и, незаметно, годы бы проспори́л, не скучая здесь, найдя бы учеников или учителей, найдя во́ждя себе или «верных» <...> солдат своим идеям.' (Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 127, n. 5).
6. 'Oдна из zamechatel'nykh idei F. M. Dostoevskogo', p. 59.
7. 'Oдна из zamechatel'nykh idei F. M. Dostoevskogo', p. 59.
8. See Ued: 68, quoted in the text, above.
9. Originally printed as a review of new poetry in Russkii vestnik, 1896, 4. The article was reprinted, restoring the cuts made to the original, together with a letter to the editors, as 'O simvolistakh', Russkoe obozrenie, 1896, 9, and was included in the collection of articles Religiia i kul'tura, St Petersburg, 1899, as 'O simvolistakh i dekadentakh'. It was later published as a separate pamphlet

titled Dekadenty. Kriticheskie etiudy, St Petersburg, 1904.

10. Letter to Pertsov, VII, 6-7 February 1897, Sochineniia, p. 493.

11. V. Alloi, 'Neizvestnoe pis'mo Andreia Belogo', Minuvshee, 5, 1988, pp. 205-21(206).

12. For a description of Rozanov's Sundays, see D. Lutokhin, 'Vospominaniia o Rozanove', Vestnik literatury, 1921, 4-5, pp. 5-7(5).

13. See his introduction to 'Russkii Nil', pub. V. G. Sukach, Novyi mir, 1989, 7, pp. 188-231(191).

14. Letter to Pertsov, XI, December 1897, Sochineniia, pp. 496-99(497).

15. 'Zadumchivyi strannik', p. 14.

16. 'Zadumchivyi strannik', p. 49.

17. See 'Zadumchivyi strannik', pp. 50-51.

18. Aleksandr Blok, letter to S. M. Solov'ev, 8 March, 1904, Sobranie sochinenii, 8 vols, Moscow-Leningrad, 1960-63, VIII, 1963, letter 51, pp. 93-98(94).

19. Letter to Pertsov, summer 1918, 'V. V. Rozanov. Pis'ma 1917-1919 godov', pub. Evg. Ivanova and T. Pomeranskaia, Literaturnaia ucheba, 1990, 1, pp. 70-88, 78-81(79).

20. 'V. V. Rozanov. Pis'ma 1917-1919 godov', p. 79.

21. See Gippius, 'Zadumchivyi strannik', p. 62.

22. V. V. Rozanov. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo, p. 64.

23. 'Dekadenty', pp. 440-41.

24. 'Dekadenty', p. 440.

25. V. G. Sukach, 'Neizvestnyi Rozanov. (Mezhdu klassikami i sovremennikami)', Voprosy literatury, 1993, 2, pp. 171-74(172-73).

26. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 225.

27. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 225-26.

28. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 49. Prishvin's diary entries echo Rozanov's analysis of Merezhkovskii's lack of physical substance: 'Мережковский вообще совершенно не способен быть в жизни, он не человек быта, плоти и крови.' ('Prishvin o Rozanove', pub. L. A. Riazanova, Kontekst, 1990, pp. 161-218(166)).



29. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 133.
30. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 48.
31. Aleksandr Blok, 'Merezhkovskii', Sobranie sochinenii, V, pp. 360-66. Blok had himself quoted Rozanov about Merezhkovskii in this article, 'Вы не слушайте, что он говорит, а посмотрите, где он стоит' (p. 360).
32. V. V. Rozanov, 'Tragicheskoe ostroumie' (1909), Voprosy literatury, 1993, 2, pp. 201-06(201-02).
33. 'Primechanie k knige N. V. Rozanovoi "iz moikh vospominanii"', pub. Iu. K. Terapiano, Novyi zhurnal, 92, 1968, pp. 130-32(132).
34. Maksim Gor'kii, letter to D. A. Lutokhin, August 10 1924, in Letopis' zhizni i tvorchestva A. M. Gor'kogo, III, p. 381.
35. Nachalo veka, p. 207.
36. 'Prishvin o Rozanove', p. 165.
37. 'Neizdannye "Opavshie list'ia"', pp. 208-09.
38. Rozanov's view on the feminine extended to his characterization of nations. He saw Russia as a 'feminine' nation, receptive to the practical ideas and innovations of 'masculine' nations like Germany, yet more powerful than them in her passivity: see 'Vozle "russkoi idei"...', Sochineniia, pp. 317-34.
39. 'Neizdannye "Opavshie list'ia"', pp. 207-08.
40. 'Zadumchivyi strannik', pp. 60-61.
41. V Sakharne, p. 352.
42. 'Neizdannye "Opavshie list'ia"', pp. 214-15.
43. 'Kritik russkogo *décadence*'a'', p. 214.
44. 'Kritik russkogo *décadence*'a', p. 215.
45. V. V. Rozanov, 'Homines novi...' (1901), in his Kogda nachal'stvo ushlo..., pp. 14-28.
46. Pertsov also uses the phrase 'homines novi' in his introduction to the first issue of Novyi put', 1903, 1, pp. 1-9(1). Olga Matich discusses the persistence of 1860s idealism, and hopes for the transformation of society, in the language and imagery of modernism in her essay, 'Dialectics of Cultural Return: Zinaida Gippius' Personal Myth', in Cultural Mythologies of Russian Modernism: From the Golden Age to the Silver Age, ed. Boris Gasparov,

Robert. P. Hughes and Irina Paperno, Berkeley, 1992, pp. 52-72(60-62). She emphasizes the use of the 1860s discourse of 'new people' by Belyi, Gippius and Rozanov. She claims to have been inspired by Irina Paperno's study of Chernyshevskii (Irina Paperno, Chernyshevskii and the Age of Realism: A Study in the Semiotics of Behaviour, Stanford, 1988), which traced parallels between the 1860s and the symbolists' hopes for the transformation of life and a new religion of heaven on earth.

47. Letter to Pertsov, XXIX, 15 December 1900, Sochineniia, p. 514.

48. 'Mimoletnoe. (Izvlecheniia)', p. 301.

49. 'Kritik russkogo décadence'a', p. 215. See also Rozanov's remarks on the enduring power of Nekrasov in Russia in the 1914 Mimoletnoe: 'Neizdannye "Opavshie list'ia"', pp. 187-90.

50. V. V. Rozanov, 'Shestidesiatye gody i "utilitarnaia kritika"', Novyi put', 1903, 2, pp. 136-141(137). See also V. V. Rozanov, 'Eshche o "60-kh godakh" nashei istorii', Novyi put', 1903, 3, pp. 171-72.

51. V. V. Rozanov, 'Popy, zhandarmy i Blok' (1909), Voprosy literatury, 1993, 2, pp. 206-10(207).

52. 'Popy, zhandarmy i Blok', p. 208.

53. 'Dekadenty', p. 439.

54. 'Dekadenstvo i obshchestvennost'', p. 339.

55. Z. N. Gippius, 'Vliublennost'', Literaturnyi dnevnik, pp. 188-212(189).

56. Gippius writing as A. Krainii, 'Literatory i literatura', Russkaia mysl', 1912, 5, pp. 26-31(28).

57. 'Literatory i literatura', p. 30. The outraged tone with which Gippius, the supposedly radical and 'decadent' critic, protests against the shocking nature of Rozanov's Uedinennoe contrasts with the reaction of supposed 'conservatives' of the slavophile tradition. Writers such as the scholar Kozhevnikov, a close friend of Fedorov, were far more receptive to the newness of the genre, which was understood within a tradition of truth-seeking or confession, than supposed innovators in writing and society, such as Gippius. See Kozhevnikov's enthusiastic letter about Uedinennoe to Rozanov, 14 April 1912, 'Pis'ma V. A. Kozhevnikova V. V. Rozanovu', pp. 87-89. It could be argued that the writings of the self-styled defenders of Russian tradition, such as Rtsy, in his book Listopad and journal Letopisets, and Rozanov in the opavshie list'ia genre, had a more lasting innovative effect on Russian

writing than many novelties of the supposedly avant-garde decadents.

58. See Posle Sakharny, p. 98.

59. See, for example, O. l. I: 333.

60. Mirsky wrote that Gippius's style was second only to Rozanov's in its 'racy Russianness': see D. S. Mirsky, 'Five Russian Letters', in his Uncollected Writings on Russian Literature, pp. 45-86(79).

61. Temira Pachmuss, Zinaida Hippus. An Intellectual Profile, Carbondale and Edwardsville, Illinois, 1971, pp. 9-11.

62. See Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, 'Revoliutsiia i religiia', Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 17 vols, 1911-1913, IX, 1911, pp. 33-92(67-77).

63. Letter to Pertsov, XXVII, 20 October 1900, Sochineniia, pp. 512-13(513). Rozanov repeatedly claimed to have an instinctive antipathy to Nietzsche and to have been unable to read his work. An article by Anna Lisa Crone argues that these disclaimers must be read with caution, and argues for a substantial influence, or at least inspiration, of Nietzsche in Rozanov's writing: see Anna Lisa Crone, 'Nietzschean, All Too Nietzschean? Rozanov's Anti-Christian Critique', in Nietzsche in Russia, ed. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, Princeton, New Jersey, 1986, pp. 95-112.

64. N. Korzhavin, 'Anna Akhmatova i "Serebrianyi vek"', Novyi mir, 1989, 7, pp. 240-61(240-41).

65. Blok made an ironic comment on the leading decadents including himself in his satirical tables of contents for the decadent journals, that mocked the style and titles of contemporary articles (Aleksandr Blok, 'Shutochnye programmy zhurnalov', Sobranie sochinenii, VII, pp. 441-45). For a discussion of Blok's attitude to decadence and modernism, see Wladimir Weidlé's essay 'The Poison of Modernism', in Russian Modernism. Culture and the Avant-Garde, 1900-1930, ed. George Gibian and H. W. Tjalsma, Ithaca, New York, 1976, pp. 18-30.

66. Aleksandr Blok, 'Nabrosok stat'i o russkoi poezii', (Dnevnik 1901-1902 goda), Sobranie sochinenii, VII, pp. 19-68(26).

67. Aleksandr Blok, letter to Rozanov, 17 February 1909, Sobranie sochinenii, VIII, letter 208, pp. 273-75(274).

68. On Blok's hostility to modernism as an innovation alien to the spirit of the Russian tradition see Wladimir Weidlé, 'The Poison of Modernism', pp. 20-23. Blok feared that

modernism's preoccupation with itself as a self-consciously innovative artistic movement led away from the central concerns of art which he believed should be with the essence of man's existence.

69. See Blok's letter to Rozanov, 17 and 20 February 1909, Sobranie sochinenii, VIII, letters 208 and 210, pp. 273-75, and 276-77, and Rozanov's letter to Blok, received 19 February 1909, Mysli o literature, pp. 516-18.

70. Aleksandr Blok, letter to his mother, 30 January 1908, Sobranie sochinenii, VIII, letter 157, pp. 226-27(227).

71. Avril Pyman describes the influence on Blok's thoughts in 1901 of a play by Gippius on transgression through blood-sacrifice, which originated from Merezhkovskii's and Rozanov's ideas about Dostoevskii's heroes. See Avril Pyman, The Life of Aleksandr Blok, 2 vols, Oxford, 1979-1980, I, The Distant Thunder, 1880-1908, pp. 94-95.

72. See Blok's diary entry for 11 October 1912, 'О модернистах я боюсь, что у них нет стержня, а только - талантливые завитки вокруг пустоты', Sobranie sochinenii, VII, pp. 162-64(164).

73. See Blok's notebook entry for 29 October 1908, in Aleksandr Blok, Zapisnye knizhki 1901-1920, Moscow, 1965, pp. 118-19. Blok praised Rozanov and Ternavtsev's contributions but argued that their discussions could only be concentrated on at a 'better time'.

74. See Aleksandr Blok, 'О реалистakh', Sobranie sochinenii, V, pp. 99-129(103).

75. Aleksandr Blok, 'Literaturnye itogi 1907 goda', Sobranie sochinenii, V, pp. 209-32(211).

76. Aleksandr Blok, 'Sud'ba Apollona Grigor'eva', Sobranie sochinenii, V, pp. 487-519(510-11). In a letter of 1916, referring to his edition of Grigor'ev, Blok argues that it is to Grigor'ev, not to himself or Rozanov, that the public should turn at this time of cultural crisis: 'Кстати - о Григорьеве: хоть бы кому пришло в голову написать по поводу редактированной мной книги о нем, а не о Розанове и не обо мне, который должен бы быть здесь последней спицей в колеснице. Ведь в Григорьеве действительно заложены искры громадной культуры, которые так и догорают до сей поры под пеплом полемики и равнодушия.' (letter to A. A. Izmailov, 28 January 1916, Sobranie sochinenii, VIII, letter 391, pp. 455-56(456)).

77. Aleksandr Blok, letter to V. M. Otrokovskii, 23 April 1913, Sobranie sochinenii, VIII, letter 343, pp. 416-17(416).

78. See, for example Blok's letter to G. I. Chulkov, Sobranie sochinenii, VIII, letter 74, pp. 126-29(129).

79. See Blok, Sobranie sochinenii, III, pp. 444-45, also Blok's diary entries for 1911, Sobranie sochinenii, VII, pp. 92 and 107 on Rozanov's exclusion from Novoe slovo. Avril Pyman writes that Blok compared the liberal intelligentsia's view of Rozanov's situation to his grandfather Beketov's view of Dostoevskii, a mixture of private admiration and public disapproval. The Life of Aleksander Blok, II, The Release of Harmony, 1908-1921, p. 192.

80. 'Sud'ba Apollona Grigor'eva', p. 511.

81. Blok, letter to Rozanov, 17 February 1909, Sobranie sochinenii, VIII, letter 208, p. 274.

82. Sobranie sochinenii, VIII, letter 208, p. 274.

83. 'Popy, zhandarmy i Blok', pp. 206-07.

84. 'Popy, zhandarmy i Blok', p. 207.

85. 'Popy, zhandarmy i Blok', p. 209.

86. Sobranie sochinenii, VIII, letter 208, p. 275.

87. Letter to Blok, received 19 February 1909, Mysli o literature, pp. 516-18(516). Blok later described this letter as 'very valuable', and sent a copy of it, together with his own comments, to Rozanov's daughter Nadezhda, in 1919, after Rozanov's death. The letter, together with a commentary on the correspondence of February 1909, is published by S. A. Beliaev and L. S. Fleishman, 'Iz blokovskoi perepiski', Blokovskii sbornik, II, Tartu, 1972, pp. 398-406.

88. Letter to Rozanov, 20 February 1909, Sobranie sochinenii, VIII, letter 210, pp. 276-77(277).

89. See 'Iz blokovskoi perepiski', p. 399.

90. For example in the essay of 1901, 'Homines novi...'.

91. Aleksandr Blok, entry for 15 July 1909, Zapisnye knizhki, 1901-1920, p. 154.

92. See 'Iz blokovskoi perepiski', p. 402. Blok notes receiving a copy of Apokalipsis nashego vremeni and a letter from Nadezhda Rozanova in the notebook entry for 30 July 1919, Zapisnye knizhki 1901-1920, p. 469. Blok's markings in this copy are detailed in Biblioteka A. A. Bloka. Opisanie, ed. K. P. Lukirskaia, 3 vols, Leningrad, 1984-86, II, 1985, p. 216 (markings in Ital'ianskie vpechatleniia, Uedinennoe and Opavshie list'ia, pp. 214-

17) .

93. See Sergei Hackel, The Poet and the Revolution, Oxford, 1975, pp. 166-71.

NOTES TO CHAPTER VII

1. Nachalo veka, p. 158.
2. Quoted in V. Zlobin, Tiazhelaia dusha, Washington, 1970, p. 33. Here Zlobin comments on the seeming incongruity of Gippius' sophistication and the passion of the sects: 'Кто, глядя на эту нарумяненную, надменную немолодую даму, лениво закуривающую тонкую надушенную папиросу, на эту капризную декадентку, мог бы сказать, что она способна живой закопаться в землю, как закапывались, в ожидании Второго Пришествия, раскольники, о которых, с таким уважением и восторгом, рассказывает в своей книге «Темный лик» В. В. Розанов.' (pp. 33-34). The diary entry is for March 7 1893, translated in Between Paris and St Petersburg. Selected diaries of Zinaida Gippius, translated and edited by Temira Pachmuss, Urbana, Chicago, 1975, p. 63. Gippius describes her meetings with the sects in a short story, 'Sokatil', in her Chernoe po belomu. Piataia kniga rasskazov, St Petersburg, 1908.
3. 'Prishvin o Rozanove', p. 171.
4. V. V. Rozanov, Apokalipsicheskaja sekta. (Khlysty i skoptsy), St Petersburg, 1914.
5. Russkaia Tserkov', p. 348.
6. Leont'ev, Pis'ma, p. 132.
7. 'Psikhologiya russkogo raskola', p. 58.
8. 'Psikhologiya russkogo raskola', p. 81.
9. Posle Sakhar'ny, p. 110.
10. George Ivask, 'Russian Modernist Poets and the Mystic Sectarrians', in Russian Modernism. Culture and the Avant-Garde, ed. George Gibian and H. W. Tjalsma, Ithaca, New York, 1976, pp. 85-106(89).
11. 'Psikhologiya russkogo raskola', pp. 57-58.
12. Khovin, Ne udodno-li-s?!, p. 28.
13. 'Prishvin o Rozanove' p. 199. See also the entry of 1922: 'Розанов схватил на лету Блока: хлысты, все они хлысты, вот тоже и он.' (Prishvin o Rozanove', p. 172).
14. See 'Prishvin o Rozanove', pp. 165-68.
15. 'Prishvin o Rozanove' p. 164.
16. Russkaia Tserkov', p. 336.

17. A History of Russian Symbolism, pp. 3-4.
18. See Apok.: 638-39
19. Siniavskii, "Opavshie List'ia", p. 8.
20. David M. Bethea, 'On the Shape of the Apocalypse in Modern Russian Fiction: Towards a Typology', in Issues in Russian Literature before 1917, ed. J. Douglas Clayton, Columbus, Ohio, 1989, pp. 176-95(176).
21. 'On the Shape of the Apocalypse in Modern Russian Fiction', p. 180.
22. 'Russkaia filosofiia', p. 227.
23. 'Russkaia filosofiia', p. 227.
24. Nachalo veka, pp. 158-63.
25. 'Perepiska P. A. Florenskogo s Andreem Belym', p. 35.
26. Nachalo veka, p. 159.
27. 'Sredi obmanutykh i obmanuvshikhsia', pp. 128-42(141-42).
28. 'Popy, zhandarmy i Blok', p. 208.
29. Nachalo veka, p. 158.
30. David M. Bethea, The Shape of Apocalypse in Modern Russian Fiction, Princeton, New Jersey, 1989, pp. 109-10, n.5.
31. Stephen Hutchings explores the conflicts inherent in Rozanov's translations between the public and private spheres as the motivation for Rozanov's late writing in 'Breaking the Circle of the Self; Domestication, Alienation and the Question of Discourse Type in Rozanov's Late Writings', Slavic Review, 52, 1993, 1, pp. 67-86.
32. 'Mimoletnoe. (Izvlecheniia)', p. 299.
33. Letter to Izmailov, 7 August 1918, 'Pis'ma V. Rozanova k A. Izmailovu', p. 126.
34. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 294-95.
35. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 108.
36. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 185.
37. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 17.
38. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 319.



39. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 27-28.
40. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 303.
41. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 321.
42. Posle Sakharny, p. 116.
43. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 116-18.
44. See Smert.: 156, O. l. II: 378.
45. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 58.
46. Pered Sakharnoi, pp. 328-29.
47. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 296-97.
48. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 91.
49. Posle Sakharny, p. 109.
50. See O. l. II: 332-33, and Posle Sakharny, pp. 109 and 116.
51. The doubts could have been in part occasioned by critical reaction to the second book of Opavshie list'ia, which several people had seen as literary artifice in contrast to the spontaneous words of Uedinennoe and the first Opavshie list'ia; see the commentary in Uedinennoe, p. 640. One letter in particular occasioned doubts about Rozanov's role; see 'Pis'mo ot neizvestnogo druga' printed in Posle Sakharny, p. 88.
52. See O sebe i zhizni svoei, pp. 759-60.
53. Mimoletnoe (1915), pp. 329-30.
54. Apok: 633.
55. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 304.
56. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 13.
57. See O. l. I: 251.
58. See for example: 'Religiia - kak svet i radost'', pp. 4-5.
59. See O. l. II: 333.
60. Posle Sakharny, p. 117.
61. Letter to Gollerbakh, 7 June 1918, 'Pis'ma Vasiliia Rozanova Erikhu Gollerbakh', p. 140.

62. Posle Sakharny, p. 107.
63. Posle Sakharny, p. 112.
64. See 'V poiskakh smysla', p. 52.
65. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 30.
66. Estetika svobody, pp. 204-05.
67. V. G. Sukach, introduction to the publication of 'Russkii Nil', p. 190.
68. V. V. Rozanov, letter to Izmailov, undated (possibly between 28 July and 3 August) 1918, 'Pis'ma V. Rozanova k A. Izmailovu', p. 125.
69. 'Pis'ma V. Rozanova k A. Izmailovu', p. 125.
70. 'Pis'ma V. Rozanova k A. Izmailovu', pp. 125-26. Rozanov had compared himself to Luther before, in his Mimoletnoe (Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 25):

Ну вот, а вы говорите - философия. Философий много - а Розанов один.

Лицо. Человек. В истории. Вот.

<....>

Лютер есть Лютер...

А Васёнок есть Васёнок...

Rozanov saw Luther as a symbol of one who, not unlike himself, sought to unify religion and life: 'Лютер, жажда «религиозной жизни», сливающихся в «одно» религии и жизни' ('Irodova legenda', p. 43). In the article 'Pamiati A. S. Khomiakova', Rozanov characterized Luther as a 'truly new man', representing a freedom from authority and a recognition of man's weakness and lack of all-encompassing knowledge. He gives Luther words that anticipate his own later appeals in Mimoletnoe: '«возлюбленные дети! Я открыл, что признавшееся всемирною и окончательною истиною - не есть всемирная и изначальная истина. Перед небом мы - сироты. Я сильнее вас - но и я слаб. Истина не в истине - а в способе отношения к истине. Человеку ничего не дано, кроме удела - искания, <....> идите за собою, и куда вам укажет ваше более зрячее сердце». <....> Религия очеловечилась. Человек скромно признал скромную свою земную ограниченность.' (V. V. Rozanov, 'Pamiati A. S. Khomiakova', Novyi put', 1904, 6, pp. 1-16(9)). The writer and contemporary of Rozanov, Natal'ia Maksheeva, claimed that Rozanov was called the 'Russian Luther', in her speech at the 'trial' of Rozanov by the Religious and Philosophical Society, January 1914: see '"Sud" nad Rozanovym. Zapiski S.-Peterburgskogo Religiozno-filosofskogo obshchestva' in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 184-215(200-01).

NOTES TO CHAPTER VIII

1. 'V poiskakh smysla', p. 53.
2. 'V. V. Rozanov', p. 51.
3. See 'Prishvin o Rozanove', pp. 180-82.
4. 'Po tikhim obiteliam', p. 264.
5. 'Smert'... i chto za neiu', pp. 257-58, footnote.
6. Letter to Pertsov, XXV, September 1900, Sochineniia, pp. 510-12(510-11).
7. 'Smert'... i chto za neiu', pp. 257-260, footnote.
8. 'Zametki o Rozanove', p. 391. See also Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 99, on Rozanov's horror of his own non-existence.
9. The rhythm of this transcription becomes, not the falling of leaves, but the burning of splinters of wood, each one giving light for a fragment more writing: 'От лучинки к лучинке, Надя, опять зажигай лучинку, скорей, некогда ждать, сейчас потухнет. Пока она горит, мы напишем еще на рубль.' 'Poslednie mysli umiraiushchego V. V. Rozanova', in T. V. Rozanova, 'Vospominaniia ob otse, Vasilii Vasil'eviche Rozanove, i vsei sem'e', pub. L. A. Il'iunina and M. M. Pavlova, Russkaia literatura, 1989, 4, pp. 160-78, 165-66(165).
10. Letter to Blok, received 19 February 1909, Mysli o literature, pp. 516-18(517).
11. 'O pis'makh pisatelei', p. 431.
12. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 328
13. Mimoletnoe (1915), p. 152.
14. 'Tragicheskoe ostroumie', p. 202.
15. Rozanov described his family as the spur to all his writing (and not merely the opavshie list'ia genre), in the second book of Opavshie list'ia: 'все выросло из одной боли, все выросло из одной точки. Литературное и личное до такой степени слилось, что для меня не было «литературы», а было «мое дело», и даже литература вообще исчезла вне «отношения к моему делу». Личное перелилось в универсальное.' [O. 1. II: 533]
16. 'Neizdannye "Opavshie list'ia"', p. 185.

17. 'Neizdannye "Opavshie list'ia"', p. 227, n. 71.
18. 'Neizdannye "Opavshie list'ia"', p. 209.
19. 'Neizdannye "Opavshie list'ia"', p. 172.
20. Ne ugodno-li-s?, p. 16.
21. Pered Sakharnoi, p. 337.
22. Letter to A. S. Glinka (Volzhskii), 16 February 1916, Uedinennoe, p. 640.
23. 'Literaturnye i politicheskie aforizmy', p. 672.
24. Pered Sakharnoi, pp. 326-27.
25. 'O prirode slova', p. 248.
26. 'Neizdannye "Opavshie list'ia"', p. 196.
27. Lit. izg.: 251, n.2.
28. Kukha. Rozanovy pis'ma, p. 47.

# SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

## V. V. ROZANOV: MAIN COLLECTIONS OF ROZANOV'S WORK

Izbrannoe, ed., intro. Iu. P. Ivask, New York, 1956. The first major publication of Rozanov's work outside Russia, with a long introductory article by Ivask. Contains short extracts from ten of Rozanov's main books, including V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo (1901), Semeinyi vopros v Rossii (1903), Kogda nachal'stvo ushlo... (1910), Liudi lunnogo sveta (1911), Literaturnye izgnanniki (1913) and Voina 1914 goda i russkoe vozrozhdenie (1915), as well as extracts from Uedinennoe (1912), Opavshie list'ia (I and II, 1913 and 1915), and Apokalipsis nashego vremeni (1917-18), as well as 3 letters to Gor'kii and 2 letters to Gollerbakh.

Izbrannoe, ed., intro. Evgeniia Zhiglevich, Munich, 1970. Second major Western collection of Rozanov's work. There are two introductions, one in Russian, by Evgeniia Zhiglevich, and one in German, by Heinrich A. Stammeler. The publication of work is fuller, and includes Uedinennoe (1912), Opavshie list'ia (I and II, 1913 and 1915), Apokalipsis nashego vremeni (1917-18), extracts from Mimoletnoe (1914), and a selection of letters to Gollerbakh.

O sebe i zhizni svoei, comp., ed., intro. V. G. Sukach, Moscow, 1990, contains the short, eponymous extract, 'O sebe i zhizni svoei' (1896), Uedinennoe (1912), Smertnoe (1913), Opavshie list'ia (I and II, 1913 and 1915), Apokalipsis nashego vremeni (1917-18), in full, with details of publication and contemporary critical reactions. Also contains 'autobiographical' prose and letters. There are three indexes. The notes are extremely detailed and contain much valuable bibliographical and biographical information.

Mysli o literature, comp., intro. A. N. Nikoliukin, Moscow, 1989. The first collection of Rozanov's writing to be published in the recent revival, contains articles of literary criticism from various periods, Legenda o Velikom inkvizitore (3rd ed. 1906), Opavshie list'ia (II, 1915), and selected letters to Chekhov, Briusov, Blok and Gorkii among others.

Sochineniia, comp. A. L. Nalepin, T. V. Pomeranskaia, intro. A. L. Nalepin, Moscow, 1990. Includes Uedinennoe (1912), articles from Literaturnye ocherki (1899) and Sredi khudozhnikov (1913) as well as previously uncollected articles from Novoe vremia and

Knizhnyi ugol, and the previously unpublished article 'S vershiny tysiacheletnei piramidy' (1918), also letters to Leont'ev, Pertsov, Fudel' and Lopatin.

Nesovmestimye kontrasty zhitia. Literaturno-esteticheskie raboty raznykh let, comp., intro. V. V. Erofeev, Moscow, 1990. Contains Legenda o Velikom Inkvizitore (3rd ed. 1906), articles from Literaturnye ocherki (1899), Okolo tserkovnykh sten (1906), Ital'ianskie vpechatleniia (1909), Temnyi lik (1911) and Liudi lunnogo sveta (1911) as well as Uedinennoe (1912) and extracts from Apokalipsis nashego vremeni (1917-18).

Religiia i kul'tura, and Uedinennoe, comp., intro. E. V. Barabanov, Moscow, 1990 (volumes I and II of Rozanov in the series 'Iz istorii otechestvennoi filosofskoi mysli', published as a supplement to Voprosy filosofii). Volume one includes the complete Religiia i kul'tura (1899), Russkaia Tserkov' (1909), L. N. Tolstoi i Russkaia Tserkov' (1912) and Temnyi lik (1911). Volume two contains Liudi lunnogo sveta (1911), Uedinennoe (1912) and Opavshie list'ia (I and II, 1913 and 1915).

Sumerki prosveshcheniia, comp. V. N. Shcherbakov, Moscow, 1990. Contains Sumerki prosveshcheniia (1899), articles from Sredi khudozhnikov (1913), the first book of Opavshie list'ia (1913), and the long essay 'Russkii Nil' (1907).

Religiia. Filosofii. Kul'tura, comp., intro. A. N. Nikoliukin, Moscow, 1992. Includes Religiia i kul'tura (1899), articles from Okolo tserkovnykh sten (1906), the first publications of Pered Sakharnoi (1913) and V Sakharne (1913), three late articles and Rozanov's outline of his intended collected works, made in 1917.

Sobranie sochinenii, ed. A. N. Nikoliukin. So far comprises:

Mimoletnoe, Moscow, 1994. Contains Mimoletnoe (1915), Chernyi ogon' (1917), and Apokalipsis nashego vremeni (1917-18).

V temnykh religioznykh luchakh, Moscow, 1994. Contains V temnykh religioznykh luchakh (1910, censored. Much of the material for this book was subsequently published in Temnyi lik (1911) and Liudi lunnogo sveta (1911), this republication also includes material from the censored book that was not published elsewhere), Russkaia tserkov' (1909) and other articles on religion.

Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994. Contains the books Ital'ianskie vpechatleniia (1909) and Sredi khudozhnikov (1913).

O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995. Large collection of articles on literature arranged by year,

from 1892-1918.

Okolo tserkovnykh sten (1906), Moscow, 1995.

V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, Moscow, 1995. Contains V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo (1901) and the uncompleted book: Iz vostochnykh motivov (1916-17).

Legenda o Velikom inkvizitore F. M. Dostoevskogo (1894) forthcoming publication in 1996.

Sochineniia Vasiliia Vasil'ievcha Rozanova, ed. V. G. Sukach. So far comprises:

Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo... Polnoe sobranie putevkh ocherkov 1899-1913 gg., Moscow, 1994. Extensive collection of Rozanov's travel writings, includes 'Russkii Nil' (1907).

O ponimanii. Opyt issledovaniia prirody, granits i vnutrennego stroeniia nauki kak tsel'nogo znaniia, Moscow, 1996. Rozanov's first ever published work. Originally published in 1886, republished for the first time 110 years later.

Proposed further publications in the series, as advertized in Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo...:

O F. M. Dostoevskom i Grafe L. N. Tolstom. Polnoe sobranie statei, napisannykh s 1890 po 1918 g.

O Vl. Solov'eva. Polnoe sobranie statei i fragmentov s prilozheniem statei Vl. Solov'eva o Rozanove i perepiskoi dvukh myslitelei

O pisateliakh i pisatel'stvakh. Polnoe sobranie statei o russkoi literature v dvukh tomakh

#### V. V. ROZANOV: INDIVIDUAL BOOKS AND ARTICLES

Where an article is part of a collection, or is a republication, the year of first publication is indicated in brackets. If the article or book was not published during Rozanov's lifetime or soon after his death, this is indicated by 'unpublished', next to the year of writing in brackets. Some articles have had various titles according to the year and place of publication: titles are given here according to the source listed (most recent editions of Rozanov's work give details of the history of publication). References to articles in collections of Rozanov give only the title, place of publication, and date(s). In the case of works recently published in journals the name of the person who prepared the publication is also given. Only one publication is referred to for each work, this is the one that is used for references within the text.

'A. P. Chekhov' (1910), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 410-20.

- 'A. S. Pushkin' (1899), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 36-47.
- 'Aforizmy i nabliudeniia' (1894), Sumerki prosveshcheniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 101-69.
- 'Afrodita i Germes', Vesy, 1909, 5, pp. 44-52.
- 'Aleks. Andr. Ivanov i kartina ego "Iavlenie Khrista narodu"' (1906), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 238-43.
- 'Aleksei Stepanovich Khomiakov. K 50-letiiu so dnia konchiny ego (23 sentiabria 1860 g. - 23 sentiabria 1910g.)' (1910), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 456-66.
- 'Amerikanizm i amerikantsy' (1904), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 164-66.
- Apokalipsicheskaia sekta. (Khlysty i skoptsy), St Petersburg, 1914.
- Apokalipsis nashego vremeni (1917-18), O sebe i zhizni svoei, Moscow, 1990, pp. 577-647.
- 'Apokaliptika russkoi literatury' (1918), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 673-76.
- 'Avtobiografiia' (1891), O sebe i zhizni svoei, Moscow, 1991, pp. 685-92.
- 'Avtoportret Vl. S. Solov'eva' (1908), pub. V. G. Sukach, Obshchestvennaia mysl'. Issledovaniia i publikatsii, I, 1989, pp. 232-46.
- 'Avtor "Balaganchika" o peterburgskikh Religiozno-filosofskikh sobraniakh' (1908), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 262-72.
- 'Bednye provintsialy...' (1910), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 443-48.
- 'Belinskii i Dostoevskii' (1914), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 592-600.
- 'Brak i khristianstvo. (Iz perepiski s pravoslavnym sviashchennikom)' (1898), V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, Moscow, 1995, pp. 107-39.
- 'Chem nam dorog Dostoevskii? (K 30-letiiu so dnia ego rozhdeniia)' (1911), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 529-36.
- Chernyi ogon' (1917, unpublished), Mimoletnoe, Moscow, 1995, pp. 335-410.
- 'Cherta kharaktera drevnei Rusi' (1892), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 82-95.
- 'Chuvstvo solntsa i rastenii u drevnikh evreev' (1903), Novyi put', 1903, 3, pp. 162-71.
- 'Dary Tserery (Shekhiny)', Novyi put', 1903, 6, pp. 138-52.
- 'Dekadenty' (1904), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 430-42.
- 'Demokratizatsiia zhivopisi' (1897), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 146-52.
- '"Demon" Lermontova i ego drevnie rodichi' (1902), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 95-105.
- 'Deti Solntsa... kak oni byli prekrasny!...' (1903), supplement to Semeinyi vopros v Rossii, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1903, II, pp. 484-516.
- 'Domik Pushkina v Moskve' (1911), Mysli o literature, Moscow, 198, pp. 305-07.



- 'Dukhovenstvo, khram, miriane' (1906), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 324-44.
- 'Duncan i ee tantsy (15 ianvaria 1913 g. v Malom teatre)' (1913), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 388-91.
- 'Dva stana' (1906), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 387-403.
- '25-letie konchiny Nekrasova (27 dekabria 1877 g. - 27 dekabria 1902 g.)' (1902), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 108-19.
- '28-go ianvaria 1881-1901 gg. (o F. M. Dostoevskom)' (1901), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 234-38.
- 'Embriony' (1899), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 287-96.
- 'Eshche o "60-kh godakh" nashei istorii', Novyi put', 1903, 3, pp. 171-72.
- 'Eshche o smerti Pushkina (1900), Mysli o literature, Moscow, 1989, pp. 247-62.
- 'Esteticheskoe ponimanie istorii' (1892), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 5-10.
- 'Estonskoe zatish'e' (1903), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 54-66.
- 'Evropeiskaia kul'tura i nashe k nei otnoshenie' (1891), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 145-53.
- 'Fedoseevtsy v Rige' (1899), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 23-36.
- 'Gde istinnyi istochnik "bor'by veka"' (1895), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 153-62.
- 'Gde zhe "religiia molodosti"? (Po povodu vystavki kartin M. V. Nesterova)' (1907), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 246-52.
- 'Genii formy. (K 100-letiiu so dnia rozhdeniia Gogolia)' (1909), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 345-52.
- 'Gogolevskie dni v Moskve' (1909), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 335-39.
- 'Gogol'' (1902), Mysli o literature, Moscow, 1989, pp. 274-80.
- 'Gogol' i Petrarkha' (1918), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 443-44.
- 'Golosa iz provintsii o missionerstve' (1901-03), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, I, pp. 192-214.
- 'G-n N. Ia. Abramovich ob "Ulitse sovremennoi literatury"' (1916), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 630-35.
- 'Granitsy nashei ery' (1899), Semeinyi vopros v Rossii, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1903, I, pp. 37-52.
- 'Gustaia kniga' (1914), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 576-85.
- 'Homines novi...' (1901), Kogda nachal'stvo ushlo... (1905-1906 gg.), St Petersburg, 1910, pp. 14-28.
- 'I shutia, i ser'ezno...' (1911), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 497-500.
- 'I. V. Kireevskii i Gertsen' (1911), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 392-400.

- 'Ideia "messianizma" po povodu novoi knigi N. A. Berdiaeva "Smysl tvorchestva"' (1916), in N. A. Berdiaev: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. A. A. Ermichev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1994, I, pp. 276-79.
- 'Ideia ratsional'nogo estestvoznaniia' (1892), Literaturnye izgnanniki, London, 1992, pp. 65-106.
- 'Interesnye knigi, interesnoe vremia i interesnye voprosy' (1900), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 37-59.
- '"Ippolit" Evripida na Aleksandrinskoi stsene' (1902), Sumerki prosveshcheniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 273-84.
- 'Irodova legenda' (1901), V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, Moscow, 1995, pp. 40-53.
- 'Istinnyi "fin de siècle"' (1898), V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, Moscow, 1995, pp. 54-60.
- Ital'ianskie vpechatleniia (1909), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 81-235.
- 'Iubileinoe izdanie Dobroliubova' (1911), pub. S. Bocharov and V. Sukach, Opyty. Literaturno-filosofskii sbornik ed. S. S. Averintsev et al., comp. A. V. Gulyga, Moscow 1990, pp. 323-26.
- 'Iudaizm', Novyi put', 1903, 7, pp. 145-61, 8, pp. 127-46, 9, pp. 160-89, 10, pp. 96-131, 11, pp. 155-84.
- 'Iv. S. Turgenev (k 20-letiiu ego smerti)' (1903), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 138-45.
- 'Ivan Liapunov' (1900), O sebe i zhizni svoei, Moscow, 1990, pp. 648-55.
- 'Iz daleka', Novyi put', 1903, 7, pp. 172-87.
- 'Iz istorii zhurnalnoi polemiki', Novyi put', 1903, 10, pp. 212-18.
- 'Iz monastyria domoi' (1913), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 612-20.
- 'Iz oklevetannoi knigi' (1899-1905), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 253-63.
- 'Iz podrobnostei tserkovnoi zhizni' (1906), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 354-85.
- 'Iz poslednikh list'ev', Knizhnyi ugol, 5, 1918, pp. 6-7.
- 'Iz poslednikh list'ev' (1918-19), Knizhnyi ugol, 7, 1921, pp. 3-8.
- 'Iz "poslednikh list'ev" V. V. Rozanova' (1918, some unpublished), pub. G. Morev, Vestnik novoi literatury, 3, 1991, pp. 183-91.
- Iz pripominanii i myslei ob A.S. Suvorine (1913), Moscow, 1992.
- 'Iz starykh pisem. Pis'ma Vlad. Serg. Solov'eva', Voprosy zhizni, 1905, 10-11, pp. 377-90.
- Iz vostochnykh motivov (1916-17), V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, Moscow, 1995, pp. 339-424.
- 'Iz zagadok chelovecheskoi prirody' (1898), V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, Moscow, 1995, pp. 21-39.
- 'K 20-letiiu konchiny K. N. Leont'eva (1891 - 12 noiabria - 1911)', O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 553-55.
- 'K lektsii g. Vl. Solov'eva', Mir iskusstva, 9-10, 1900, pp. 192-95.

- 'K lektsii g. Vl. Solov'eva ob Antikhriste' (1902, revision of above, unpublished), pub. T. V. Pomeranskaia and A. L. Nalepin, Kontekst, 1992 (pub. 1993), pp. 81-88.
- 'K 50-letiiu konchiny Ap. A. Grigor'eva', O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 600-02.
- 'K vseobshchemu uspokoeniiu nervov...' (1911), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 296-98.
- 'Kak proizoshel tip Akakiia Akakievicha' (1894), Nesovmestimye kontrasty zhitia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 234-46.
- 'Kak khorosho inogda "ne ponimat'"... (1911), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 292-95.
- 'Katkov kak gosudarstvennyi chelovek' (1899), Nesovmestimye kontrasty zhitia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 340-48.
- 'Khristianstvo passivno ili aktivno?' (1897), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 186-98.
- 'Khristos i "bogaty i unoshia"' (1904), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 427-31.
- 'Khristos - Sudia mira' (1903), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 542-59.
- 'Khudozhestvo ispuga i mirovoi ego smysl' (1910), O sebe i zhizni svoei, Moscow, 1990, pp. 660-64.
- 'Kiev i kievliane' (1910), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 537-63.
- Kogda nachal'stvo ushlo... (1905-1906 gg.), St Petersburg, 1910.
- 'Kogda-to znamenityi roman' (1905), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 184-92.
- 'Kolebaniia mira' (1918), Knizhnyi ugol, 4, 1918, pp. 9-11.
- 'Konstantin Leont'ev i ego "popechiteli"' (1919), pub. V. Konstantinov, Nachala, 1992, 2, pp. 88-91.
- 'Kontsy i nachala "bozhestvennoe" i "demonicheskoe", bogi i demony. (Po povodu glavnogo siuzheta Lermontova)', Mir iskusstva, 1902, 8, pp. 122-37.
- 'Kritik russkogo décadence'a', pub. V. Sukach, Voprosy literatury, 1993, 2, pp. 210-19.
- 'Krotkii demonizm' (1897), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 199-206.
- 'Kto istinnyi vinovnik etogo?', Russkoe obozrenie, 1896, 8, pp. 640-55.
- 'Kul'turnaia khronika russkogo obshchestva i literatury za XIX vek' (1895), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 96-120.
- 'L. Andreev i ego "t'ma"' (1908), pub. V. Sukach, Voprosy literatury, 1993, 2, pp. 189-96.
- L. N. Tolstoi i Russkaia Tserkov' (1912), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 355-68.
- Legenda o velikom inkvizitore F. M. Dostoevskogo. Opyt kriticheskogo kommentariia (1891) and 'Prilozheniia' (1894), Nesovmestimye kontrasty zhitia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 37-186, 186-224.
- 'Literaturno-khudozhestvennye novinki' (1912), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 299-306.
- Literaturnye izgnanniki (1913), London, 1992 (reprint of St Petersburg, 1913 edition).

- 'Literaturnye novinki' (1904), pub. V. Sukach, Voprosy literatury, 1993, 2, pp. 174-85.
- Literaturnye ocherki, St. Petersburg, 1899.
- 'Literaturnye simulianty' (1909), pub. V. Sukach, Voprosy literatury, 1993, 2, pp. 197-201.
- 'Lomonosov. Ego lichnost' i sud'ba (4 apreliia 1765 g. - 4 apreliia 1915 g.)' (1915), pub. S. Bocharov and V. Sukach, Opyty. Literaturno-filosofskii sbornik, ed. S. S. Averintsev et al., comp. A. V. Gulyga, Moscow 1990, pp. 335-40.
- Liudi lunного sveta (1911), Uedinennoe, Moscow, 1990, pp. 7-192.
- 'M. Gor'kii i o chem u nego "est' somneniia", a v chem on "gluboko ubezhden"...' (1916), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 619-23.
- 'M. Iu. Lermontov (k 60-letiiu konchiny)' (1901), Mysli o literature, Moscow, 1989, pp. 263-73.
- 'M. V. Nesterov' (1907), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 252-58.
- 'Magicheskaiia stranitsa u Gogolia' (1909), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 383-421.
- 'Mechta v shchelku' (1902), O sebe i zhizni svoei, Moscow, 1990, pp. 655-69.
- 'Merezhkovskii protiv "Vekh". (Poslednee Religiozno-filosofskoe sobranie)' (1909), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 354-58.
- Mesto khristianstva v istorii (1899), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 22-46.
- 'Metafizicheskii razgovor' (1910), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 514-25.
- 'Mimokhodom. (Iz sluchainykh vpechatlenii)', Novyi put', 1903, 1, pp. 133-37.
- Mimoletnoe (1914-1916, unpublished), published as 'Mimoletnoe' V. V. Rozanova', pub. Iu. K. Terapiano, Novyi zhurnal, 92, 1968, pp. 119-30.
- Mimoletnoe (1914, unpublished), published as 'Neizdannye "Opavshie list'ia" ("Mimoletnoe") V. V. Rozanova', pub. V. G. Sukach, Kontekst, 1989, pp. 172-228.
- Mimoletnoe (1914, unpublished), published as 'Mimoletnoe. (Iz vlecheniia)', pub. S. Bocharov and V. Sukach, Opyty. Literaturno-filosofskii sbornik, ed. S. S. Averintsev et al., comp. A. V. Gulyga, Moscow, 1990, pp. 294-315.
- Mimoletnoe (1915, unpublished), published as Mimoletnoe. 1915 god., Mimoletnoe, Moscow, 1994, pp. 5-334. (Also published by A. N. Nikoliukin in Novyi zhurnal, 190, 1993, pp. 171-257, 192-193, 1993, pp. 178-273.)
- 'Missionerstvo i missionary' (1901-03), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 175-227.
- 'Moliashchaisia Rus'. (Na vystavke kartin M. V. Nesterova)' (1907), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 270-73.
- 'Na granitsakh poezii i filosofii (Stikhotvoreniia Vladimira Solov'eva), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 48-56.

- 'Na knizhnom i literaturnom rynke (Artsybashev)' (1908), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 280-86.
- 'Na kontserte Shaliapina' (1913), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 409-13.
- 'Na lektsii o Dostoevskom' (1909), pub. S. Bocharov and V. Sukach, Opyty. Literaturno-filosofskii sbornik, ed. S. S. Averintsev et al., comp. A. V. Gulyga, Moscow, 1990, pp. 316-21.
- 'Na panikhide po Vl. S. Solov'evu' (1901), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 239-42.
- 'Na vystavke "Mira iskusstva"' (1903), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 215-17.
- 'Na zakate dnei. L. Tolstoi i byt' (1907), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 231-36.
- 'Narodnyia chteniia v Peterburge' (1902), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 130-40.
- 'Nash "Antosha Chekhonte"' (1910), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 421-26.
- 'Nashi voziublennye usopshie' (1900), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 95-109.
- 'Natsional'nye talanty' (1902), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 375-78.
- 'Ne v novykh li dniakh kritiki?' (1916), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 623-30.
- 'Ne ver'te belletristam...' (1911), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 483-87.
- 'Nebesnoe i zemnoe' (1906), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 281-323.
- 'Nechto iz sedoi drevnosti' (1899), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 247-86.
- 'Nekrasov v gody nashego uchenichestva' (1908), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 244-55.
- 'Neotsenimyi um' (1911), pub. S. Bocharov and V. Sukach, Opyty. Literaturno-filosofskii sbornik, ed. S. S. Averintsev et al., comp. A. V. Gulyga, Moscow 1990, pp. 326-34.
- 'Neuznannyi fenomen...' (1903), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 203-15.
- 'Nominalizm v khristianstve' (1898), V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, Moscow, 1995, pp. 61-66.
- 'Novaia religiozno-filosofskaia kontseptsia Nikolaia Berdiaeva. "Smysl tvorchestva. Opyt opravdaniia cheloveka"' (1916), N. A. Berdiaev: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. A. A. Ermichev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1994, I, pp. 261-69.
- 'Novye embriony' (1901), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 296-306.
- 'Novye sobytiia v literature' (1911), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 494-97.
- 'O blagodushii Nekrasova' (1903), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 125-38.
- 'O bor'be s zapadom, v sviazi s literaturnoi deiatel'nost'iu odnogo iz slavianofilov' (1890), Literaturnye izgnanniki, London, 1992, pp. 3-64.
- 'O delikatnosti i prochikh melochakh' (1910), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 631-37.

- 'O Dostoevskom' (1894), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 170-82.
- 'O drevnikh i novykh zhertvakh' (1902), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 447-50.
- 'O khudozhestvennykh narodnykh vystavkakh' (1897), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 257-66.
- 'O Konst. Leont'ev'e' (1917), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 651-57.
- 'O Lermontove' (1916), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 641-43.
- 'O "Narodo"-Bozhii, kak novoi idee Maksima Gor'kogo' (1908), pub. V. Sukach, Voprosy literatury, 1993, 2, pp. 186-88.
- 'O neporochnoi sem'e i ee glavnom uslovii' (1899), Semeinyi vopros v Rossii, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1903, I, pp. 72-84.
- 'O pisateliakh i pisatel'stve' (1899), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 231-47.
- 'O pis'makh pisatelei' (1909), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 430-33.
- 'O Pushkinskoi akademii' (1899), Mysli o literature, Moscow, 1989, pp. 232-39.
- 'O rabotakh L. V. Shervuda' (1905), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 227-29.
- 'O simvolistakh i dekadentakh' (1896), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 163-76.
- 'O simvolistakh. Pis'mo v redaktsiiu' (1896), Russkoe obozrenie, 1896, 9, pp. 318-21.
- 'O sladchaishem Iisuse i gor'kikh plodakh mira' (1908), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1909, pp. 560-71.
- 'O studencheskikh besporiadekakh' (1898), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 121-28.
- 'O sviashchenstve i "blagodati" sviashchenstva' (1902), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 437-44.
- 'O vere russkikh' (1906, unpublished), pub. M. M. Pavlova, Russkaia literatura, 1991, 1, pp. 111-23.
- 'O zvukakh bez otnosheniia k smyslu', Novyi put', 1903, 7, pp. 165-72.
- 'Ob a-dogmatizme khristianstva' (1906), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 455-72.
- 'Ob odnoi osobennoi zaslude Vl. S. Solov'eva' (1904), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 367-83.
- 'Ob odnom somnenii gr. L. N. Tolstogo' (1901), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 231-34.
- 'Ob osnovnom ideale tserkvi' (1902), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 444-46.
- 'Ob otluchenii gr. L. Tolstogo ot Tserkvi' (1902-06), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 451-54.
- 'Ot avtora', 'V svoem uglu', Novyi put', 1903, 2, pp. 135-52 (135-36).
- 'Ot chego ne udalsia pamiatnik Gogoliu?' (1909), Mysli o literature, Moscow, 1989, pp. 292-98.

- 'Odna iz zamechatel'nykh idei F. M. Dostoevskogo' (1911), pub. V. G. Sukach, Nachala, 1991, 1, pp. 54-65.
- 'Odna podrobnost' vetkhozavetnogo kul'ta' (1903), Novyi put', 1903, 8, pp. 146-53.
- 'Ogni sviashchennye' (1905), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 1-13.
- 'Okolo boliashchikh' (1898), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 3-9.
- Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972 (reprint of St Petersburg, 1906 edition).
- Opavshie list'ia (1913), O sebe i zhizni svoei, Moscow, 1990, pp. 166-330.
- Opavshie list'ia. Korob vtoroi i poslednii (1915), O sebe i zhizni svoei, Moscow, 1990, pp. 331-576.
- 'Optina Pustyn'' (1903), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 95-126.
- 'Otvety V. V. Rozanova na anketu nizhegorodskoi gubernskoi uchenoi arkhivnoi komissii' (1909), O sebe i zhizni svoei, Moscow, 1990, pp. 707-12.
- 'P. A. Florenskii ob A. S. Khomiakove' (1916), P. A. Florenskii: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. K. G. Isupov, St Petersburg, 1996, pp. 367-79.
- 'Pamiati A. S. Khomiakova' (1904), Novyi put', 1904, 6, pp. 1-16.
- 'Pamiati F. M. Dostoevskogo (28 ianvaria 1881-1906 gg.)' (1906), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 198-205.
- 'Pamiati usopshikh' (1899), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 216-30.
- 'Pamiati Vl. Solov'eva', Mir iskusstva, 15-16, 1900, pp. 33-36.
- 'Pamiati Vladimira Frantsevicha Erna', Veshnie vody, 22, 1917, April, pp. 78-79.
- 'Pechatanie sittsev' (1904), Letopisets, St Petersburg, 1904, 1, pp. 5-7.
- Pered Sakharnoi (1913, unpublished), Religiia. Filosofiia. Kul'tura, Moscow, 1992, pp. 314-42.
- '50 let vlianiia' (1898), Nesovmestimye kontrasty zhitia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 348-59.
- 'Pisatel'-khudozhnik i partiia' (1904), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 175-84.
- 'Pisateli-tseliteli' (1901), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 275-77.
- 'Plan polnogo sobraniia sochinenii, sostavlennyi V. V. Rozanovym v 1917 godu' (1917, unpublished), Religiia. Filosofiia. Kul'tura, Moscow, 1992, p. 368.
- 'Poezdka v Iasnuiu Polianu' (1908), Mysli o literature, Moscow, 1989, pp. 281-86.
- 'Poslednie list'ia', Knizhnyi ugol, 6, 1919, pp. 6-10.
- 'Po povodu odnogo stikhotvoreniia Lermontova' (1904), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 379-88.
- 'Po tikhim obiteliam' (1904), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 382-421.
- 'Pochemu my otkazyvaemsia ot "nasledstva 60-70kh godov"?' (1891), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 120-31.

- 'Poezdka v Iasnuiu Polianu' (1908), Mysli o Literature, Moscow, 1989, pp. 281-86.
- 'Pogrebateli Rossii' (1909), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 421-24.
- 'Poluponiatsnye ruiny' (1910), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 508-13.
- 'Pominki po slavianofil'stve i slavianofilam' (1904), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 401-09.
- 'Poputnye zametki' (1899), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 389-91.
- 'Popy, zhandarmy i Blok' (1909), pub. V. Sukach, Voprosy literatury, 1993, 2, pp. 206-10.
- Posle Sakhar'nykh (1913, unpublished), pub. Viktor Sukach, Literaturnaia ucheba, 1989, 2, pp. 89-122.
- 'Pozdnie fazy slavianofil'stva' (1895), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 183-202.
- 'Predislovie k "V Sakharne"' (1915, unpublished), pub. Viktor Sukach, Literaturnaia ucheba, 1989, 2, pp. 85-89.
- 'Prelesti staroknizhnaia' (1913), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 401-05.
- 'Prilezhnyi redaktor' (1911), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 259-60.
- 'Psikhika i byt studenchestva', Novyi put', 1904, 1, pp. 209-35, 2, pp. 94-111, 3, pp. 121-34.
- 'Psikhologiya russkogo raskola' (1896), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 47-81.
- 'Pushkin i Gogol'' (1891), Nesovmestimye kontrasty zhitia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 225-46.
- 'Pushkin i Lermontov' (1914), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 602-04.
- 'Raboty Golubkinoi' (1910), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 274-75.
- 'Rassypavshiesia Chichikovy' (1917-18, unpublished), Religiia. Filosofiia. Kul'tura, Moscow, 1992, p. 367.
- Religiia i kul'tura (1899), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 17-326.
- 'Religiia, kak chudo i ochevidnost'. Primechania k razmyshleniiam neveruiushchego' (1906), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 411-34.
- 'Religiia - kak svet i radost'' (1899), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 1-22.
- 'Revoliutsionnaia Oblomovka' (1917, unpublished), Religiia. Filosofiia. Kul'tura, Moscow, 1992, pp. 357-63.
- 'Rus' i Gogol'' (1909), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 352-54.
- Russkaia Tserkov' (1906), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 327-54.
- 'Russkie istoricheskie portrety na vystavke v Tavricheskom dvortse' (1905), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 427-29.
- 'Russkii Nil. (Vpechatleniia na Volge)' (1907), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 329-407.
- 'S iuga' (1898), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 10-41.



- 'S pechal'nym prazdnikom' (1917-18, unpublished), Religiia. Filosofiiia. Kul'tura, Moscow, 1992, pp. 364-66.
- 'S vershiny tysiacheletnei piramidy. (Razmyshlenie o khode russkoi literatury)' (1918), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 448-64.
- 'Schastlivyi obladatel' svoikh sposobnostei' (1902), Mir iskusstva, 8, 1902, Khudozhestvennaia khronika, pp. 29-31.
- Semeinyi vopros v Rossii, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1903.
- 'Sem'ia i zhizn'' (1897), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 207-15.
- 'Sem'ia kak religiia' (1898), V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, Moscow, 1995, pp. 67-81.
- 'Shestidesiatye gody i utilitarnaia kritika', Novyi put', 1903, 2, pp. 135-52.
- 'Skepticheskii um' (1901), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 242-53.
- 'Slovo Bozhie v nashem uchen'i' (1900), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 125-74.
- 'Sluchai v derevne' (1900), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 432-47.
- 'Smert'... i chto za neiu' (1910), Al'manakh "Smert'", publication of Novyi zhurnal dlia vsekh, St Petersburg, 1910, pp. 243-63.
- Smertnoe (1913), O sebe i zhizni svoei, Moscow, 1990, pp. 133-64.
- 'Smysl asketizma' (1897), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 216-27.
- 'Solntse', Knizhnyi ugol, 4, 1918, p. 5.
- 'Sotsializm v teorii i v nature' (1917), pub. Viktor Chalmaev, Lepta, 1991, 5, pp. 128-32.
- 'Spory okolo imeni Belinskogo' (1916), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 585-91.
- 'Sredi inoiazychnykh (D. S. Merezhkovskii)' (1903), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 145-63.
- 'Sredi obmanutykh i obmanuvshikh', Novyi put', 1904, 4, pp. 128-42, 5, pp. 217-45, 7, pp. 90-124, 8, pp. 108-45.
- 'Stennaia zhivopis'' (1913), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1990, pp. 406-09.
- Sumerki prosveshcheniia (1899), Sumerki prosveshcheniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 3-254.
- 'Sviatoe chudo bytiia' (1900), Semeinyi vopros v Rossii, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1903, II, pp. 44-60.
- '"Sviatost'" i "genii" v istoricheskom tvorchestve' (1916), in N. A. Berdiaev: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. A. A. Ermichev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1994, I, pp. 270-75.
- 'Sviatost' i smert'' (1903), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 422-26.
- 'Tablitsa voprosov religiozno-filosofskikh' (1906), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 473-85.
- 'Taina stikhii', Novyi put', 1903, 6, pp. 164-70.
- 'Tainstvennye sootnosheniia' (1918), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 445-47.

- 'Talantlivost' i beztalannost' v dukhovenstve' (1901), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 267-75.
- 'Tantsy nevinnosti (Aisedora Dunkan)' (1909), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 286-95.
- 'Tema i Bokkachio, i Sokrata. (O tsenzure)' (1912), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 560-64.
- Temnyi lik. Metafizika khristianstva (1911), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 372-582.
- 'Teper' i prezhd'e' (1896), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 177-85.
- 'Tolstoi i Dostoevskii ob iskusstve' (1906), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 205-21.
- 'Tolstoi mezhd'u velikimi mira' (1908), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 307-12.
- 'Tolstoi v literature' (1910), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 467-69.
- 'Tragediia mekhanicheskogo tvorchestva' (1912), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 558-60.
- 'Tragicheskoe ostroumie' (1909), pub. V. Sukach, Voprosy literatury, 1993, 2, pp. 201-06.
- 'Trepetnoe derevo' (1901), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 379-81.
- 'Trevozhnaia noch'' (1902), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 572-82.
- 'Tri glavnye printsipa obrazovaniia' (1893), Sumerki prosveshcheniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 91-101.
- 'Tri momenta v razvitii russkoi kritiki' (1892), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 154-69.
- 'Trudy M. V. Lomonosova' (1915), pub. S. Bocharov and V. Sukach, Opyty. Literaturno-filosofskii sbornik, ed. S. S. Averintsev et al., comp. A. V. Gulyga, Moscow 1990, pp. 340-47.
- 'Tsel' chelovecheskoi zhizni' (1892), in Smysl zhizni. Antologiya, ed., comp. N. K. Gavriushin, Moscow, 1994, pp. 19-64.
- 'Tsenzura' (1916), Mysli o literature, Moscow, 1989, pp. 497-500.
- 'Tserkov' prezhd'e pochivshikh i tserkov' zhivyykh' (1903), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 225-41.
- 'Tut est' nekaia taina' (1904), Vesy, 1904, 2, pp. 14-19.
- 'U Aisedory Dunkan' (1913), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 396-98.
- Uedinennoe (1912), O sebe i zhizni svoei, Moscow, 1990, pp. 35-132.
- 'Ugolok Bessarabii' (1913), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 567-94.
- 'Universitet i nauka', Novyi put', 1903, 2, pp. 210-14.
- 'Upadok sem'i' (1899), Semeinyi vopros v Rossii, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1903, I, pp. 53-64.
- 'V Berline' (1910), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 484-94.
- 'V chaianiakh "dvizheniia vody"', Novyi put', 1904, 6, pp. 247-62.

- 'V chem glavnyi nedostatok "nasledstva 60-70-kh godov"? (1891), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 132-44.
- 'V domike Gete' (1910), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., Moscow, 1994, pp. 484-94.
- 'V. G. Belinskii (K 100-letiiu dnia rozhdeniia)' (1911), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 501-08.
- 'V iul'skie dni' (1902), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 140-46
- V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo (1901), V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, Moscow, 1995, pp. 7-336.
- 'V muzeiakh Vatikana' (1901), Inaia zemlia, inoe nebo..., pp. 130-41
- 'V "religiozno-filosofskikh sobraniakh" v S.- Peterburge 1902-1903 g.g.', Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 435-72.
- V Sakharne (1913, unpublished), Religiia. Filosofiia. Kul'tura, Moscow, 1992, pp. 343-56.
- V sosedstve Sodoma. (Istoki Izrailia), St Petersburg, 1914.
- 'V sovete rabochikh i soldatskikh deputatov' (1917), pub. Viktor Chalmaev, Lepta, 1991, 5, pp. 133-38.
- 'V svoem uglu. Ot avtora', Novyi put', 1903, 2, pp. 135-36.
- 'Vechnaia pamiat'. 24 ianvaria - 27 iuliia 1896 g.' (1896), Literaturnye izgnanniki, London, 1992, pp. 455-531.
- 'Vekovaia godovshchina (30 maia 1811 g. - 30 maia 1911 g.)' (1911), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 508-515.
- '"Vetkhie" tezisy i "novye" antitezisy' (1906), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 485-97.
- 'Vo dvore iazychnikov' (1902-08, unpublished materials), pub. T. V. Pomeranskaia and A. L. Nalepin, Kontekst, 1992 (pub. 1993), pp. 27-37.
- Voina 1914 goda i russkoe vozrozhdenie, Petrograd, 1915.
- 'Voprosy tserkovnoi zhivopisi' (1901), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 185-87.
- 'Vospitatel'noe znachenie tantsev Ais. Dunkan' (1914), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 419-20.
- 'Vozdykhantsy' (1905), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 395-400.
- 'Vozle "russkoi idei"...' (1911), Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 317-34.
- 'Vozvrat k Pushkinu. (K 75-letiiu dnia ego konchiny)' (1912), Mysli o literature, Moscow, 1989, pp. 326-30.
- 'Vsemirnaia skuka' (1901), Kogda nachal'stvo ushlo... (1905-1906 gg.), St Petersburg, 1910, pp. 3-13.
- 'Vynos kumirov' (1903), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, II, pp. 317-40.
- 'Zabytoe vozle Tolstogo...' (1910), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 470-73.
- 'Zacharovannyi les' (1905), V mire neiasnogo i nereshennogo, Moscow, 1995, pp. 352-55.
- 'Zamechatel'naia stat'ia', Novyi put', 1903, 5, pp. 149-62.
- 'Zametka o Pushkine' (1899), Mysli o literature, Moscow, 1989, pp. 240-46.

- 'Zametka o vazhneishikh techeniakh russkoi filosofskoi mysli v sviazi s nashei perevodnoi literaturoi po filosofii', Voprosy filosofii i psikhologii, 3, 1890, Spetsial'nyi otdel, pp. 1-34.
- 'Zanimatel'nyi vecher (Eshche o siamskikh tantsovshchitsakh)' (1901), Sredi khudozhnikov, Moscow, 1994, pp. 187-93.
- 'Zh. Zh. Russo' (1912), O pisatel'stve i pisateliakh, Moscow, 1995, pp. 569-75.
- 'Zheltyi chelovek v peredelke' (1900), Okolo tserkovnykh sten, 2 vols, Farnborough, 1972, I, pp. 75-93.
- 'Zhenshchina pered velikoiu zadacheiu' (1898), Religiia i kul'tura, Moscow, 1990, pp. 228-46.

#### V. V. ROZANOV: PUBLISHED CORRESPONDENCE

##### CORRESPONDENCE PUBLISHED BY ROZANOV:

- 'Iz perepiski S. A. Rachinskogo', Russkii vestnik, 1902, 10, pp. 603-29, 11, pp. 143-57, 1903, 1, pp. 218-43.
- 'Iz pisem drugov i nedrugov' (letters of protoierei A. Ustynskii and sviashch. I. Filevskii), Novyi put', 1903, 2, pp. 142-52, Novyi put', 1903, 4, pp. 109-50 (116-134).
- Leont'ev, Konstantin, Pis'ma k Vasiliiu Rozanovu, London, 1981 (originally published in Russkii vestnik, 1903, 4, pp. 633-52, 5, pp. 155-82, 6, pp. 409-38).
- 'Pis'ma N. N. Strakhova' and 'Iu. N. Govorukha-Otrok v neskol'kikh pis'makh', Literaturnye izgnanniki, London, 1982 (reprint of St Petersburg, 1913 edition), pp. 112-414 and 437-54, respectively.
- 'Pis'ma A. S. Suvorina k V. V. Rozanovu', Iz pripominanii i myslei ob A. S. Suvorine, Moscow, 1992, pp. 59-118 (originally published as Pis'ma A. S. Suvorina k V. V. Rozanovu, St Petersburg, 1913).

##### OTHER PUBLICATIONS OF CORRESPONDENCE:

Where the publication is in a journal, the names of those who have prepared the publication are given, except in the cases, for example a series of publications in Vestnik Russkogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia, where no name is given. The list is in chronological order of publication;

publications in Vestnik Russkogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia and Novyi zhurnal, and those in recent collections of Rozanov, are listed separately.

- 'Pis'ma V. V. Rozanovu', in V. S. Solov'ev, Pis'ma Vladimira Sergeevicha Solov'eva, ed. E. L. Radlov, 3 vols, St Petersburg, 1908-1911, III, 1911, pp. 43-54.
- Pis'ma V. V. Rozanova k E. Gollerbakh, Berlin, 1922, extracts from these letters are published in E. Gollerbakh, V. V. Rozanov. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo, Moscow, 1991 (republication of Petrograd, 1922 edition), pp. 68-74.
- 'Pis'ma A. M. Gor'kogo k V. V. Rozanovu i ego pomety na knigakh Rozanova', pub. L. N. Iokar, Kontekst, 1978, pp. 297-342.
- 'Iz pisem V. V. Rozanova E. F. Gollerbakh', Sovetskaia bibliografiia, 1989, 5, pp. 90-91.
- 'Neizdannye pis'ma V. V. Rozanova k K. N. Leont'evu', pub. T. V. Pomeranskaia, Literaturnaia ucheba, 1989, 6, pp. 125-40. (also in Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 466-88).
- 'Pis'ma k B. A. Griftsovu', pub. Evgenii Barabanov, Nashe nasledie, 1989, 6, pp. 57-61.
- 'O "bezvidnoi družbe". (Pis'ma V. V. Rozanova k M. Gor'komu)', pub. I. Bocharova, Voprosy literatury, 1989, 10, pp. 149-66.
- 'V. V. Rozanov. Pis'ma 1917-1919 godov', pub. Evg. Ivanova and T. Pomeranskaia, Literaturnaia ucheba, 1990, 1, pp. 76-88.
- 'Iz arkhiva A. G. Dostoevskoi. Perepiska A. G. Dostoevskoi s V. V. Rozanovym', pub. E. Garetto, Minuvshee. Istoricheskii al'manakh, 9, 1990, pp. 258-93.
- '"Raspoiasannye pis'ma" V. V. Rozanova' (Pis'ma V. V. Rozanova k Z. N. Gippius), pub. M. Pavlova, Literaturnoe obozrenie, 1991, 11, pp. 67-71.
- 'Perepiska V. V. Rozanova i M. O. Gershenzon, 1909-1918', pub. V. Proskurina, Novyi mir, 1991, 3, pp. 215-42.
- 'Pis'ma Vasiliia Rozanova Erikhu Gollerbakh', Lepta, 1991, 5, pp. 139-42.
- Extracts from the letters of Pavel Florenskii to Rozanov in Pavel Florenskii, Detiam moim. Vospominan'ia proshlikh dnei. Genealogicheskie issledovaniia. Iz solovetskikh pisem. Zaveshchanie, comp. igumen Andronik (A. S. Trubachev) et al., Moscow, 1992, pp. 276-82.

Publications of Rozanov's correspondence in Vestnik Russkogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia:

- 'Pis'ma S. N. Bulgakova V. V. Rozanovu', pub. Iurii Ivask, 130, 1979, 4, pp. 168-76.

- 'Pis'ma Gershenzona k V. V. Rozanovu', 140, 1983, 3-4, pp. 72-85.
- 'Pis'ma Bulgakova k Rozanovu', 141, 1984, 1-2, pp. 114-22.
- 'Pis'ma V. A. Kozhevnikova V. V. Rozanovu', 143, 1984, 4, pp. 87-100.
- 'Vosem' neizdannyykh pisem k M. P. Ivanovoi', 152, 1988, 1, pp. 251-55.
- 'Pis'mo S. A. Askol'dova V. V. Rozanovu', 152, 1988, 1, pp. 256-57.
- 'Pis'ma V. Rozanova k N. Glubokovskomu', 157, 1989, 2, pp. 152-64.
- 'Deviat' pisem V. V. Rozanova k P. P. Barsukovu', pub. V. G. Sukach, 162-63, 1991, 2-3, pp. 247-60.
- 'Dva pis'ma V. V. Rozanova k P. B. Struve', 162-63, 1991, 2-3, pp. 261-64.

Publications of Rozanov's correspondence in Novyi zhurnal:

- 'Pis'ma V. V. Rozanova k V. S. Solov'evu. Vyderzhki iz pisem A.S. Suvorinu', pub. D. Perchonko, 130, 1978, pp. 92-100.
- 'Pis'ma V. V. Rozanova k S. A. Rachinskomu', pub. D. Perchonko, 134, 1979, pp. 149-72.
- 'Pis'ma V. Rozanova k A. Izmailovu', pub. D. Perchonko, 136, 1979, pp. 121-26.
- 'Pis'ma I. F. Romanova (Rtsy) k V. V. Rozanovu', pub. Iu. Ivask, 159, 1985, pp. 154-95.

Letters published in Mysli o literature, Moscow, 1989, pp. 503-29:

- 'K. N. Leont'evu' (1891), pp. 503-04.
- 'P. P. Pertsovu' (1896), pp. 505-06.
- 'L. N. Tolstomu' (1898), pp. 506-07.
- 'A. P. Chekhovu' (1899), p. 508.
- 'V. Ia Briusovu' (1901 and 1904), p. 509.
- 'A. S. Suvorinu' (1904), pp. 510-11.
- 'M. Gor'komu' (1905), pp. 511-15.
- 'M. Gor'komu' (1911-1912), pp. 518-22.
- 'M. Gor'komu' (1917), pp. 523-24.
- 'M. Gor'komu' (1919), pp. 527-28.
- 'V. G. Korolenko' (1906), pp. 515-16.
- 'A. A. Bloku' (1909), pp. 516-18.
- 'E. F. Gollerbakhu' (1915), p. 523.
- 'E. F. Gollerbakhu' (1918), pp. 525-26.
- 'D. S. Merezhkovskomu' (1918), pp. 526-27.
- 'N. E. Makarenko' (1919), pp. 528-29.

Letters published in Sochineniia, Moscow, 1990, pp. 466-520:

- 'K. N. Leont'evu' (1891, 9 letters), pp. 466-88.
- 'P. P. Pertsovu' (1896-1901, 32 letters), pp. 489-516.
- 'I. I. Fudeliu' (1895 and 1912, 2 letters), pp. 517-18.
- 'G. A. Lopatinu' (date unknown, after 1909), pp. 519-20.

Letters published in O sebe i zhizni svoei, Moscow, 1990, pp. 670-84:

- 'N. V. Rozanovu' (1870), pp. 670-72.
- 'V. F. Bauderu' (1876), pp. 672-75.
- 'N. Baranskomu' (1886), pp. 675-77.
- 'A. A. Aleksandrovu' (1898), pp. 677-79.
- 'N. P. Vishniakovu' (1916), p. 679.
- 'P. B. Struve' (1918), pp. 680-82.
- 'Druz'iam' (1919), pp. 682-83.
- 'Literatoram' (1919), pp. 683-84.

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF ROZANOV'S WORK**

- Belen'kii, I. L., and Serebrianaia, I. E., 'Iz bibliografii V. V. Rozanova (1917-1991 gg.)', Nachala, 1992, 3, pp. 91-93 (includes recent book and journal publications).
- Fateev, V. A., 'Bibliografiia', in his V. V. Rozanov. Zhizn'. Tvorchestvo. Lichnost', Leningrad, 1991, pp. 359-62 (lists select book and journal publications within Rozanov's lifetime and immediately posthumous publications until 1922, with the exception of the 1970 Izbrannoe and the 1989 publication of Posle Sakharny).
- Gollerbach, E. 'Bibliografiia. Knigi i zhurnalnye stat'i V. V. Rozanova', V. V. Rozanov. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo, Moscow, 1991, pp. 75-79 (includes publications up until 1922, not comprehensive).
- Sukach, V. G., 'Materialy k bibliografii V. V. Rozanova', De Visu, 1993, 3, pp. 62-67 (list of all books published 1886-1918, as well as sources and page references of contemporary reviews for each book).
- 'Bibliografiia: Knigi i zhurnalnye stat'i V. V. Rozanova', Sovetskaia bibliografiia, 1989, 5, pp. 86-88.

# BIBLIOGRAPHIES OF WRITING ON ROZANOV

- Belen'kii, I. L., and Serebrianaia, I. E., 'Iz bibliografii V. V. Rozanova (1917 - 1991 gg.)', Nachala, 1992, 3, pp. 93-95 (lists mainly recent Russian journal publications).
- Crone, Anna Lisa, 'Selected Bibliography of Works on Rozanov', in her Rozanov and the End of Literature. Polyphony and the Dissolution of Genre in Solitaria and Fallen Leaves, Wurzburg, 1978, pp. 135-39 (select works of Russian and Western criticism, with comments by the author).
- Fateev, V. A., 'Literatura o V. V. Rozanove', in his V. V. Rozanov. Zhizn'. Tvorchestvo. Lichnost', Leningrad, 1991, pp. 362-66 (selection of works both from Rozanov's lifetime and more recent publications).
- Fateev, V. A., 'Bibliografiia rabot o V. V. Rozanove 1886-1986 gg.' in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 535-62 (two extensive bibliographies of writing published in Rozanov's lifetime until the present day, one of works in Russian, the other in foreign languages).
- Gollerbakh, E., 'Literatura o V. V. Rozanove', in his V. V. Rozanov. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo, Moscow, 1991, pp. 80-83 (select works, up until 1921).
- 'Literatura o Rozanove', Sovetskaia bibliografiia, 1989, 5, pp. 88-90 (select works up to 1921).



# SECONDARY LITERATURE

- Abramovich, N. Ia., 'Novoe vremia i "soblaznennye mladentsy". V. V. Rozanov', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 220-22.
- Alloi, V., 'Neizvestnoe pis'mo Andreia Belogo', Minuvshee, 5, 1988, pp. 205-21.
- Aronova, S. I., ed., Bakhtin i filosofskaya kul'tura XX veka, Problemy bakhtinologii, 1, 1-2, St Petersburg, 1991.
- Averintsev, S. S., 'Grecheskaya "literatura" i blizhnevostochnaya "slovesnost"'. Dva tvorcheskikh printsipa', in his Religiya i literatura, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1981, pp. 5-33.
- Averintsev, S. S., 'Na perekrestke literaturnykh traditsii', in his Religiya i literatura, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1981, pp. 34-67.
- Averintsev, S. S., 'Bakhtin, smekh, khristianskaya kul'tura', in M. M. Bakhtin kak filosof, ed. L. A. Gogotishvili and P. S. Gurevich, Moscow, 1992, pp. 7-19.
- Averintsev, S. S., 'Bakhtin and the Russian Attitude to Laughter', in Bakhtin, Carnival and Other Subjects, ed. David Shepherd, Critical Studies, 3, 2-4, 1\2, Amsterdam and Atlanta, 1993, pp. 13-19.
- Averintsev, S. S., 'Raznorechiya i svyaznost' mysli Viacheslava Ivanova', introduction to Viacheslav Ivanov, Lik i lichiny Rossii. Estetika i literaturnaya teoriya, comp. S. S. Averintsev, Moscow, 1995, pp. 7-24.
- Baehr, Stephen L., 'The Troika and the Train: Dialogues between Tradition and Technology in Nineteenth-Century Russian Literature', in Issues in Russian Literature before 1917, ed. J. Douglas Clayton, Columbus, Ohio, 1989, pp. 85-106.
- Bakhtin, M. M., Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo, 4th edn., Moscow, 1979.
- Bakhtin, M. M., Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, comp. S. G. Bocharov, Moscow, 1979.
- Bakhtin, M. M., Avtor i geroi v esteticheskoi deiatel'nosti, in M. M. Bakhtin, Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, comp. S. G. Bocharov, Moscow, 1979, pp. 7-180.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 'Iskusstvo i otvetstvennost'', in M. M. Bakhtin, Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 5-6.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 'Iz knigi "Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo"', in M. M. Bakhtin, Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 181-87.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 'Iz zapisei 1970-1971 godov', in M. M. Bakhtin, Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 336-60.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 'K metodologii gumanitarnykh nauk', in M. M. Bakhtin, Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 361-73.

- Bakhtin, M. M., 'K pererabotke knigi o Dostoevskom', in M. M. Bakhtin, Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 308-27.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 'Problema rechevykh zhanrov', in M. M. Bakhtin, Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 237-80.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 'Problema teksta v lingvistike, filologii i drugikh gumanitarnykh naukakh. Opyt filosofskogo analiza', in M. M. Bakhtin, Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, pp. 281-307.
- Bakhtin, M. M., Formal'nyi metod v literaturovedenii, New York, 1982.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 'Problema soderzhaniia, materiala i formy v slovesnom khudozhestvennom tvorchestve', in M. M. Bakhtin, Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i, comp. S.G. Bocharov and V. V. Kozhinov, Moscow, 1989, pp. 26-89.
- Bakhtin, M. M., 'Zametki', in M. M. Bakhtin, Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i, comp. S.G. Bocharov and V. V. Kozhinov, Moscow, 1989, pp. 509-31.
- Bakhtin, M. M., Art and Answerability. Early Philosophical Essays by M. M. Bakhtin, ed. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov, trans. and notes Vadim Liapunov, supplement trans. Kenneth Brostrom, Austin, Texas, 1990.
- Barabanov, E. V., introduction to V. V. Rozanov, Religiia i kul'tura, 2 vols, Moscow, 1990, I, pp. 3-16.
- Beliaev, S. A., and Fleishman, L. S., 'Iz blokovskoi perepiski', in Blokovskii Sbornik, II, Tartu, 1972, pp. 398-406.
- Belyi, Andrei, 'Pravda o russkoi intelligentsii. Po povodu sbornika Vekhi', Vesy, 1909, 5, pp. 65-68.
- Belyi, Andrei, 'Otsy i deti russkogo simvolizma', in his Arabeski, Munich, 1969 (reprint of Moscow, 1911 edition), pp. 273-384.
- Belyi, Andrei, 'O pisateliakh', in his Arabeski, Munich, 1969, pp. 387-501.
- Belyi, Andrei, Nachalo veka, Moscow, 1990.
- Belyi, Andrei, 'Apokalipsis v russkoi poezii', in his Simvolizm kak miroponimanie, comp. L. A. Sugai, Moscow, 1994, pp. 408-17.
- Belyi, Andrei, 'Iskusstvo', in his Simvolizm kak miroponimanie, pp. 238-43.
- Belyi, Andrei, 'Magiia slov', in his Simvolizm kak miroponimanie, pp. 131-42.
- Belyi, Andrei, 'Pesn' zhizni' in his Simvolizm kak miroponimanie, pp. 167-77.
- Belyi, Andrei, 'Problema kul'tury', in his Simvolizm kak miroponimanie, pp. 18-25.
- Belyi, Andrei, 'Simvolizm kak miroponimanie', in his Simvolizm kak miroponimanie, pp. 244-55.
- Belyi, Andrei, 'Simvolizm i sovremennoe russkoe iskusstvo', in his Kritika. Estetika. Teoriia simvolizma, comp. A. L. Kazin, Moscow, 1994, 2 vols, I, pp. 265-301.
- Belyi, Andrei, 'Rets.: V. Rozanov, "Kogda nachal'stvo ushlo...", 1905-1906 gg.', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, ed. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 78-80.

- Benjamin, Walter, 'On Language as Such and on the Language of Man', Reflections, ed. Peter Demetz, New York, 1986, pp. 314-32.
- Benjamin, Walter, 'The Task of the Translator', Illuminations, ed. Hannah Arendt, London, 1992, pp. 70-82.
- Benua, A. N., 'Religiozno-filosofskoe obshchestvo. Kruzhok Merezhkovskikh. V. V. Rozanov', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 132-42.
- Berdiaev, Nikolai, Konstantin Leont'ev. Ocherk iz istorii russkoi religioznoi mysli, Paris, 1926.
- Berdiaev, Nikolai, Russkaia ideia, Paris, 1971.
- Berdiaev, Nikolai, Sud'ba Rossii, Moscow, 1990 (reprint of Moscow, 1918 edition).
- Berdiaev, Samopoznanie, Moscow, 1991.
- Berdiaev, N. A., 'Khristos i mir. Otvet V. V. Rozanovu', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 25-40.
- Berdiaev, N. A., 'O "vechno-bab'em" v russkoi dushe', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 41-51.
- Berg, Mikhail, 'Lekarstvo ot zhizni', Literaturnaia gazeta, 19th October 1994, p. 3.
- Bernstein, Michael André, 'The Poetics of Ressentiment', in Rethinking Bakhtin. Extensions and Challenges, ed. Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson, Evanston, Illinois, 1989, pp. 197-223.
- Bethea, David M., The Shape of Apocalypse in Modern Russian Fiction, Princeton, New Jersey, 1989.
- Bethea, David M., 'On the Shape of the Apocalypse in Modern Russian Fiction: Towards a Typology', in Issues in Russian Literature before 1917, ed. J. Douglas Clayton, Columbus, Ohio, 1989, pp. 176-95.
- Blok, Aleksandr, Avtobiografiia 1915. Dnevnik 1901-21. Sobranie sochinenii, ed. V. N. Orlov et al., 8 vols, Moscow-Leningrad, 1960-63, VII, 1963.
- Blok, Aleksandr, 'Bezvremen'e', Sobranie sochinenii, V, 1962, pp. 66-82.
- Blok, Aleksandr, 'Dnevnik zhenshchiny, kotoruiu nikto ne liubil', Sobranie sochinenii, VI, 1962, pp. 29-37.
- Blok, Aleksandr, 'Literaturnye itogi 1907 goda', Sobranie sochinenii, V, 1962, pp. 209-32.
- Blok, Aleksandr, '"Materialy dlia poemy"', Sobranie sochinenii, III, 1961, pp. 444-60.
- Blok, Aleksandr, 'Merezhkovskii', Sobranie sochinenii, V, 1962, pp. 360-66.
- Blok, Aleksandr, 'Narod i intelligentsia', Sobranie sochinenii, V, 1962, pp. 318-28.
- Blok, Aleksandr, 'O realistakh', Sobranie sochinenii, V, pp. 99-129.
- Blok, Aleksandr, Pis'ma 1898-1921. Sobranie sochinenii, VIII, 1963.
- Blok, Aleksandr, 'Rytsar' - monakh', Sobranie sochinenii, V, 1962, pp. 446-54.

- Blok, Aleksandr, 'Sud'ba Apollona Grigor'eva', Sobranie sochinenii, V, 1962, pp. 487-519.
- Blok, Aleksandr, Zapisnye knizhki 1901-20, comp. ed., Vl. Orlov, Moscow, 1965.
- Blok, Aleksandr, and Belyi, Andrei, Dialog poetov o Rossii i revoliutsii, comp. M. F. P'ianykh, Moscow, 1990.
- Bocharov, S. G., '"Esteticheskoe okhranenie" v literaturnoi kritike (Konstantin Leont'ev o russkoi literature)', Kontekst, 1977, pp. 142-93.
- Bocharov, S. G., 'Ob odnom razgovore i vokrug nego', Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2, 1993, pp. 70-89.
- Bogdanovich, A. I., 'Iurodstviushchaia literatura - "o liubvi" Menshikova. "Sumerki prosveshcheniia" V. Rozanova', Mir Bozhii, 1899, 4, pp. 1-18.
- Bonetskaia, N. K., 'Teoriia dialoga u M. Bakhtina i P. Florenskogo', in Bakhtin i filosofskaia kul'tura XX veka, ed. S. I. Aronova, Problemy bakhtinologii, 1, 2, St Petersburg, 1991, pp. 52-60.
- Bonetskaia, N. K., 'M. M. Bakhtin i traditsii russkoi filosofii', Voprosy filosofii, 1993, 1, pp. 83-93.
- Bratchenko, S. L., 'Kontseptsiiia lichnosti: M. Bakhtin i psikhologiiia', in Bakhtin i filosofskaia kul'tura XX veka, ed. S. I. Aronova, Problemy bakhtinologii, 1, 1, St Petersburg, 1991, pp. 66-75.
- Brown, Clarence, Mandelstam, Cambridge, 1973.
- Brumfield, William C., 'The West and Russia: Concepts of Inferiority in Dostoevsky's Adolescent', in Russianness, ed. Robert L. Belknap, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1990, pp. 144-52.
- Burenin, V. P., 'Kriticheskie ocherki. Literaturnoe iurodstvo i klikushestvo', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 303-13.
- Catteau, Jacques, Dostoevsky and the Process of Literary Creation, Cambridge, 1989.
- Cassedy, Stephen, 'Belyi the Thinker', in Andrey Bely. Spirit of Symbolism, ed. John E. Malmstad, Ithaca, New York, 1987, pp. 313-35.
- Cassedy, Stephen, 'Icon and Logos. The Role of Orthodox Theology in Modern Language Theory and Literary Criticism', in Christianity and the Eastern Slavs, ed. Boris Gasparov et al., 3 vols, II, Russian Culture in Modern Times, ed. Robert P. Hughes and Irina Paperno, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1994, pp. 311-24.
- Chizhevskii, D., Gegel' v Rossii, Paris, 1939.
- Chudakova, Marietta, 'Plyvushchii korabl'', Novyi mir, 1989, 7, pp. 231-35.
- Chukovskii, K. I., 'Otkrytoe pis'mo V. V. Rozanovu', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 126-34.
- Clark, Katerina, and Holquist, Michael, Mikhail Bakhtin, Cambridge, Mass., 1984.
- Clark, Katerina, and Holquist, Michael, 'A continuing dialogue', Slavic and East European Journal, 30, 1986, 1, pp. 96-102.

- Clowes, Edith W., The Revolution of Moral Consciousness. Nietzsche in Russian Literature, 1890-1914, Dekalb, Illinois, 1988.
- Crone, Anna Lisa, Rozanov and the End of Literature. Polyphony and the Dissolution of Genre in Solitaria and Fallen Leaves, Wurzburg, 1978.
- Crone, Anna Lisa, 'Nietzschean, All Too Nietzschean? Rozanov's Anti-Christian Critique', Nietzsche in Russia, ed. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, Princeton, New Jersey, 1986, pp. 98-112.
- Crone, Anna Lisa, 'Rozanov and Autobiography: The Case of Vasily Vasilievich', Autobiographical Statements in Twentieth-Century Russian Literature, ed. Jane Gary Harris, Princeton, New Jersey, 1990, pp. 36-51.
- Crone, Anna Lisa, 'Mandel'shtam's Rozanov', Stoletie Mandel'shtama. Materialy simpoziuma, ed. Robin Aizlewood and Diana Myers, Tenafly, New Jersey, 1994, pp. 56-71.
- Curtis, James. M., 'Mikhail Bakhtin, Nietzsche and Russian Pre-revolutionary Thought', Nietzsche in Russia, ed. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, Princeton, New Jersey, 1986, pp. 331-54.
- d'Amelia, Antonella, 'Pozdnie povesti Remizova: v poiskakh zhanra' in Aleksei Remizov. Issledovaniia i materialy, ed. A. M. Gracheva, St Petersburg, 1994, pp. 104-14.
- Danilevskii, A. A., 'Iz kommentariiev k Kukke A. M. Remizova', Problemy russkoi literatury i kul'tury, ed. L. Biukling and P. Pesonen, Studia Russica Helsingensia et Tartiensia, 3, Helsinki, 1992, pp. 93-102.
- Danow, David. K., The Thought of Mikhail Bakhtin. From Word to Culture, London, 1991.
- Dostoevskiaia, A. G., Vospominaniia, Moscow, 1987.
- Dostoevskii, F. M., Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v tridtsati tomakh, ed. V. G. Bazanov et al., Leningrad, 1972-1990.
- Durylin, S. N., 'V. V. Rozanov', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 237-45.
- Dzhimbinov, Stanislav, 'The Return of Russian Philosophy', in Russian Thought after Communism. The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage, ed. James P. Scanlan, Armonk, New York, 1994, pp. 11-22.
- Emerson, Caryl, 'The Outer Word and Inner Speech: Bakhtin, Vygotsky and the Internalization of Language', in Bakhtin. Essays and Dialogues on his Work, ed. Gary Saul Morson, Chicago, 1986, pp. 21-40.
- Emerson, Caryl, 'Russian Orthodoxy and the Early Bakhtin', Religion and Literature, 22, 1990, 2-3, pp. 109-31.
- Emerson, Caryl, 'The Making of M. M. Bakhtin as Philosopher', in Russian Thought after Communism. The Recovery of a Philosophical Heritage, ed. James P. Scanlan, Armonk, New York, 1994, pp. 206-26.
- Emerson, Caryl, 'Protiv zakonornosti. Solov'ev, Shestov, pozdnii Tolstoi, rannii Bakhtin', in Bakhtinologiya. Issledovaniia, perevody, publikatsii, ed. K. G.

- Isupov, Problemy bakhtinologii, St Petersburg, 1995, 2, pp. 117-31.
- Ern, V. F., Bor'ba za Logos, Sochineniia, comp. N. V. Kotrelev and E. V. Antonova, Moscow, 1991, pp. 9-294.
- Ern, V. F., 'Nalet Val'kirii (Otvét N. A. Berdiaevu)', Sochineniia, comp. N. V. Kotrelev and E. V. Antonova, Moscow, 1991, pp. 360-68.
- Erofeev, Venedikt, Glazami ekstsentríka, New York, 1982.
- Erofeev, Venedikt, Moskva - Petushki, Moscow, 1989.
- Erofeev, Viktor, 'Raznotsvetnaia mozaika rozanovskoi mysli', introduction to V. V. Rozanov, Nesovmestimye kontrasty zhitíia, comp. V. V. Erofeev, Moscow, 1990, pp. 6-36.
- Erofeev, Viktor, 'Poslednii klassicheskii myslitel'', introduction to A. F. Losev, Strast' k dialektike. Literaturnye razmyshleniia filosofa, ed. S. N. Zenkin, Moscow, 1990, pp. 3-13.
- Fateev, V. A., V. V. Rozanov. Zhizn'. Tvorchestvo. Lichnost', Leningrad, 1991.
- Fateev, V. A., 'Publitsist s dushoi metafizika i mistika', introductory article to V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologíia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 5-36.
- Fateev, V. A., comp., V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologíia, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995.
- Fediakin, S. R., 'Rozanov', entry in Russkaia filosofíia. Slovar', ed. M. A. Maslin, Moscow, 1995, pp. 417-19.
- Fedorov, N. F., 'O pis'menakh. Posmertnaia stat'ia', Nashe nasledie, 1989, 6, pp. 117-18.
- Fedotov, G. P., 'V. V. Rozanov. "Opavshie list'ia"', in his Litso Rossii (1918-1930), Paris, 1967, pp. 300-04.
- Fedotov, Georgii, Sviatye drevnei rusi, Moscow, 1990.
- Ferrari-Bravo, Donatella, 'Poniatie slova u Bakhtina i Florenskogo', Europa Orientalis, 6, 1987, pp. 135-49.
- Ferrari-Bravo, Donatella, 'More on Bakhtin and Florensky', Mikhail Bakhtin and the Epistemology of Discourse, ed. Clive Thomson, Critical Studies, 2, 1-2, Amsterdam, Atlanta, 1990, pp. 111-21.
- Filosofov, D. V., 'Rets.: V. V. Rozanov, "Okolo tserkovnykh sten", tt. I i II', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologíia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 5-15.
- Florenskii, P. A., Stolp i utverzhdénie istiny, comp. Igumen Andronik, M. S. Trubacheva, P. V. Florenskii, 2 volume edition of P. A. Florenskii in the series 'iz istorii otechestvennoi filosofskoi mysli', Moscow, 1990, I, parts I and II.
- Florenskii, P. A., 'Mysl' i iazyk', in his U vodorazdelov mysli, comp. Igumen Andronik, M. S. Trubacheva, P. V. Florenskii, 2 volume edition of P. A. Florenskii in the series 'iz istorii otechestvennoi filosofskoi mysli', Moscow, 1990, II, pp. 109-338.
- Florenskii, P. A., 'Na Makovtse', U vodorazdelov mysli, pp. 17-23.
- Florenskii, P. A., 'Puti i sredotochiia', U vodorazdelov mysli, pp. 26-38.

- Florenskii, P. A., 'Iz pisem P. A. Florenskogo k docheri O. P. Florenskoi', comp. igumen Andronik (A. S. Trubachev) et al., Kontekst, 1991, pp. 93-99.
- Florenskii, P. A., 'Perepiska s Andreem Belym', comp. igumen Andronik (A. S. Trubachev) et al., Kontekst, 1991, pp. 23-51.
- Florenskii, P. A., 'Poema "Eskhatologicheskaiia mozaika". Chast' vtoraiia', comp. igumen Andronik (A. S. Trubachev) et al., Kontekst, 1991, pp. 68-92.
- Florenskii, P. A., '"Zoloto v lazuri" Andreia Belogo. Kriticheskaiia stat'ia', comp. igumen Andronik (A. S. Trubachev) et al., Kontekst, 1991, pp. 62-67.
- Florenskii, P. A., 'O V. V. Rozanove (pis'mo M. I. Lutokhinu)', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 316-17.
- Frank, S. L., Iz istorii russkoi filosofskoi mysli kontsa XIX veka i nachala XX veka. Antologiiia, Washington and New York, 1965.
- Fudel', sviashch., Ob o. Pavle Florenskom (1882-1943), Paris, 1988.
- Fudel', sviashch., 'K. Leont'ev i Vl. Solov'ev v ikh vzaimnykh otnosheniiakh', in K. N. Leont'ev: pro et contra. Antologiiia, 2 vols, comp. A. P. Kozyrev and A. A. Korol'kov, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 393-408.
- Fudel', sviashch., 'Kul'turnyi ideal K. N. Leont'eva', in K. N. Leont'ev: pro et contra. Antologiiia, 2 vols, comp. A. P. Kozyrev and A. A. Korol'kov, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 160-80.
- Gachev, Georgii, Russkaia duma, Moscow, 1991.
- Gaiser-Schmittmann, Svetlana, "Moskva-Petushki" - The Rest is Silence, New York, 1989.
- Galkovskii, Dmitrii, 'Beskonechnyi tupik. (Otryvok iz knigi)', Nachala, 1991, 1, pp. 66-71.
- Gasparov, Boris, 'The "Golden Age" and its Role in the Cultural Mythology of Russian Modernism', in Cultural Mythologies of Russian Modernism. From the Golden Age to the Silver Age, ed. Boris Gasparov, Robert P. Hughes and Irina Paperno, Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1992, pp. 1-16.
- Germanov, V., 'Religiia byta (Rozanov. Uedinennoe. Opavshie list'ia, t. I i II)', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 251-66.
- Gershenson, M. O. and Ivanov, Viach. Iv., Perepiska iz dvukh uglov, in Russkie filosofy konets XIX veka - seredina XX veka. Antologiiia, comp. A. L. Dobrokhoto et al., Moscow, 1993, pp. 181-211.
- Gerstein, Linda, Nikolai Strakhov, Cambridge, Mass., 1971.
- Giliarov-Platonov, N. P., Otkuda nigilizm?, Moscow, 1904.
- Ginsburg, Lidia, Chelovek za pis'mennym stolom, Leningrad, 1989.
- Gippius, Z. N., 'Vechnyi zhid', Novyi put', 1903, 9, pp. 241-44.
- Gippius, Z. N., (as A. Krainii), 'Literatory i literatura', Russkaia mysl', 1912, 5, pp. 26-31.

- Gippius, Z. N., 'Byt i sobytiia', in her Literaturnyi dnevnik. 1899-1907, Munich, 1970 (reprint of St Petersburg, 1908 edition), pp. 283-308.
- Gippius, Z. N., 'Chitaiu knigi', in her Literaturnyi dnevnik. 1899-1907, pp. 85-93.
- Gippius, Z. N., 'Dekadenstvo i obshchestvennost'', in her Literaturnyi dnevnik. 1899-1907, pp. 327-46.
- Gippius, Z. N., 'Khleb zhizni', in her Literaturnyi dnevnik. 1899-1907, p. 1-42.
- Gippius, Z. N., 'Kritika liubvi', in her Literaturnyi dnevnik. 1899-1907, pp. 43-64.
- Gippius, Z. N., 'Vliublennost'', in her Literaturnyi dnevnik. 1899-1907, pp. 187-212.
- Gippius, Z. N., 'Zadumchivyi strannik. O Rozanove', in her Zhivye litsa, 2 vols, Munich, 1971 (reprint of Prague, 1925 edition), II, pp. 7-92.
- Gogotishvili, L. A., and Gurevich, P. S., eds., M. M. Bakhtin kak filosof, Moscow, 1992.
- Gollerbakh, E., V. V. Rozanov. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo, Moscow, 1991.
- Gorbunov, V. V., Ideia sobornosti v russkoi religioznoi filosofii (piat' izbrannykh portretov), Moscow, 1994.
- Govorukha-Otrok, Iu. N., 'Zametki o progresse i tsivilizatsii, Russkoe obozrenie, 1897, 1, pp. 89-96, and 2, pp. 740-49.
- Govorukha-Otrok, Iu. N., 'Neskol'ko slov po povodu konchiny K. N. Leont'eva', K. N. Leont'ev: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. A. P. Kozyrev and A. A. Korol'kov, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 15-19.
- Govorukha-Otrok, Iu. N., 'Vo chto veril Dostoevskii?', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 269-81.
- Griftsov, B. A., Tri myslitel'ia. V. Rozanov, D. Merezhkovskii, L. Shestov, Moscow, 1911.
- Grigor'ev, Apollon, 'Paradoksy organicheskoi kritiki (Pis'ma k F. M. Dostoevskomu)', Sobranie sochinenii, ed. V. F. Savodnik, 14 vols, 1915-16, II, 1915, pp. 131-64.
- Gulyga, Arsenii, '"Kak muchitel'no trudno byt' russkim" (O zhizni i tvorchestve Vasiliia Rozanova)', Lepta, 1991, 5, pp. 143-51.
- Gur'ianova, Nina, 'Remizov i "budetliane"', in Aleksei Remizov. Issledovaniia i materialy, ed. A. M. Gracheva, St Petersburg, 1994, pp. 142-50.
- Holquist, Mihael, 'The Architectonics of Answerability', introduction to M. M. Bakhtin, Art and Answerability. Early Philosophical Essays, ed. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov, trans. and notes Vadim Liapunov, supplement trans. Kenneth Bostrom, Austin, Texas, 1990, pp. ix - xlix.
- Hutchings, Stephen C., 'Breaking the Circle of the Self: Domestication, Alienation and the Question of Discourse Type in Rozanov's Late Writings', Slavic Review, 52, 1993, 1, pp. 67-86.
- Il'in, V. N., 'Stilizatsiia i stil'. 2 - Remizov i Rozanov', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra.



- Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 406-30.
- Il'inskii, Oleg, 'Religioznye vzgliady rannego Bakhtina', Russkoe vozrozhdenie, 31, 1985, pp. 59-70.
- Il'iunina, Liudmila, '"Pishite, pishite no bez "pokhval'nogo slova"...". Literatory o Rozanove', Nashe nasledie, 1989, 6, pp. 61-63.
- Iskrzhitskaia, I. Iu., 'P. Chaadaev - O. Mandel'shtam - M. Bakhtin (K tipologii gumanitarnogo myshleniia)', Bakhtin i filosofskaia kul'tura XX veka, ed. S. I. Aronova, Problemy bakhtinologii, 1, 2, St Petersburg, 1991, pp. 70-77.
- Isupov, K. G., 'Mikhail Bakhtin i Aleksander Meier', Bakhtin i filosofskaia kul'tura XX veka, ed. S. I. Aronova, Problemy bakhtinologii, 1, 2, St Petersburg, 1991, pp. 60-70.
- Isupov, K. G., comp., ed., Bakhtinologiya. Issledovaniia, perevody, publikatsii, Problemy bakhtinologii, 2, St Petersburg, 1995.
- Ivanov, E. P. (E. I.), 'O smradnom i sviatom', Novyi put', 1903, 10, pp. 173-76.
- Ivanov, Viacheslav, 'Ekskurs. O sekte i dogmate', in his Borozdy i mezhi. Opyty esteticheskie i kriticheskie, Letchworth, 1971, (reprint of Moscow, 1916 edition), pp. 160-63.
- Ivanov, Viacheslav, 'Manera, litso i stil'', in his Borozdy i mezhi. Opyty esteticheskie i kriticheskie, Letchworth, 1971, pp. 165-86.
- Ivanov, Viacheslav, 'Mysli o simvolizme', in his Borozdy i mezhi. Opyty esteticheskie i kriticheskie, Letchworth, 1971 pp. 145-59.
- Ivanov, Viacheslav, 'Lik i lichiny Rossii', in his Lik i lichiny Rossii. Estetika i literaturnaia teoriia, comp. S. S. Averintsev, Moscow, 1995, pp. 312-50.
- Ivanov, Viacheslav, 'Nash iazyk', in his Lik i lichiny Rossii. Estetika i literaturnaia teoriia, comp. S. S. Averintsev, Moscow, 1995, pp. 25-31.
- Ivanova, E. V., 'Ob iskliuchenii V. V. Rozanova iz religiozno-filosofskogo obshchestva' with publication of 'Doklad soveta i prenii po voprosu ob otnoshenii obshchestva k deiatel'nosti V. V. Rozanova', Nash sovremennik, 1990, 10, pp. 104-22.
- Ivanova, E. V., 'Italiia - V. V. Rozanovu', Voprosy filosofii, 1991, 3, pp. 133-39.
- Ivanov-Razumnik, R. V., 'Iurodivyi russkoi literatury', in his Tvorchestvo i kritika, 3 vols, St Petersburg, 1910-13, II, 1911, pp. 180-211.
- Ivask, Iu., 'Vstupitel'naia stat'ia', in V. V. Rozanov, Izbrannoe, ed. Iu. P. Ivask, New York, 1956, pp. 7-59.
- Ivask, Iu., 'Rozanov i o. Pavel Florenskii', Vestnik Russkogo Studencheskogo Khristianskogo Dvizheniia, 42, 1956, pp. 22-26.
- Ivask, Iu., introduction to N. Ia. Danilevskii, Rossia i Evropa, New York, 1966 (reprint of Moscow, 1894 edition), pp. v-xxx.

- Ivask, Iu., Konstantin Leont'ev. Zhizn' i tvorchestvo, Bern and Frankfurt, 1974.
- Ivask, Iu., 'Russian Modernist Poets and the Mystic Sectarians', in Russian Modernism. Culture and the Avant-Garde, 1900-1930, ed. George Gibian and H. W. Tjalsma, Ithaca, New York, 1976, pp. 85-106.
- Izmailov, A. A., 'Vifleem ili Golgofa? (V. V. Rozanov i "neudavsheesia khristianstvo")', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 81-90.
- Izmailov, A. A., 'Zakat eresiarkha (+ V. V. Rozanov)', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 91-100.
- Jackson, Robert Louis, Dostoevsky's Quest for Form. A Study of His Philosophy of Art, Bloomington, Indiana, 1978.
- Jackson, Robert Louis, Dialogues with Dostoevsky. The Overwhelming Questions, Stanford, California, 1993.
- Kablukov, S. P., 'O V. V. Rozanove (iz "Dnevnika" za 1909 g.)', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 200-22.
- Kagan, M. S., 'Ideia dialoga v filosofsko-esteticheskoi kontseptsii M. Bakhtina: zakonomernosti formirovaniia, dukhovnyi kontekst i sotsiokul'turnyi smysl', Bakhtin i filosofskaia kul'tura XX veka, ed. S. I. Aronova, Problemy bakhtinologii, 1, 1, St Petersburg, 1991, pp. 17-31.
- Kagan, Iosif, 'Put' Rozanova', Obshchestvennye nauki, 1990, 5, pp. 201-12.
- Khlodovskii, R. I., 'Italiia V. V. Rozanova (Zametki i vypiski o svoego roda "dialoge": Rozanov - Italiia - Pushkin)', Materialy nauchnoi konferentsii Vipperovskie chteniia, 25, ed. V. Kozlov, Dialog kul'tur, Moscow, 1994, pp. 88-104.
- Khoruzhii, S. S., 'Filosofskii simvolizm Florenskogo i ego zhiznennye istoki', in his Posle pereryva. Puti russkoi filosofii, St Petersburg, 1994, pp. 100-30.
- Khovin, Viktor, Ne ugodno-li-s ?! Siluet V. V. Rozanova, Petrograd, 1916.
- Khovin, Viktor, 'Rozanov umer', Knizhnyi ugol, 6, 1919, pp. 4-6.
- Khovin, Viktor, Na odnu temu, Petrograd, 1921.
- Kline, George L., Religious and Anti-religious Thought in Russia, Chicago, 1968.
- Korzhavin, N., 'Anna Akhmatova i "Serebrianyi vek"', Novyi mir, 1989, 7, pp. 240-61.
- Latynina, A. N., '"Vo mne proiskhodit razlozhenie literatury." V. V. Rozanov i ego mesto v literaturnoi bor'be epokhi', Voprosy literatury, 1975, 2, pp. 169-205.
- Lawrence, D. H., 'Solitaria, by V. V. Rozanov', Phoenix. The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence, 2nd ed., London, 1961, pp. 367-71.
- Lawrence, D. H., 'Fallen Leaves, by V. V. Rozanov', Phoenix. The Posthumous Papers of D. H. Lawrence, 2nd ed., London, 1961, pp. 388-92.

- Leont'ev, Konstantin, 'Neskol'ko vospominanii i myslei o pokoinom Ap. Grigor'eve. Pis'mo k Nik. Nik. Strakhovu', in Apollon Grigor'ev, Vospominaniia, ed. R. V. Ivanov-Razumnik, Moscow-Leningrad, 1930, pp. 528-56.
- Leont'ev, Konstantin, Vizantizm i slavianstvo, in his Vostok, Rossiia i slavianstvo, 2 vols, Osnabruck, 1966 (reprint of Moscow, 1885-86 edition), I, pp. 81-189.
- Leont'ev, Konstantin, 'Pis'ma k Vladimiru Sergeevichu Solov'evu', Izbrannoe, comp. I. N. Smironov, Moscow, 1993, pp. 339-97.
- Leont'ev, Konstantin, 'Srednii evropeets kak ideal i orudie vseмирного razrusheniia', Izbrannoe, comp. I. N. Smironov, Moscow, 1993, pp. 119-68.
- Levin, V., '"Neklassicheskie" tipy povestvovaniia nachala XX veka v istorii russkogo literaturnogo iazyka', Slavica Hierosolymitana, 5-6, 1981, pp. 245-75.
- Levinas, Emmanuel, 'The Transcendence of Words', in The Levinas Reader, ed. Sean Hand, Oxford, 1989, pp. 144-49.
- Lominadze, S. and Sukach, V., 'V. Rozanov - literaturnyi kritik', Voprosy literatury, 1988, 4, pp. 176-79.
- Losev, A. F., Vladimir Solov'ev i ego vremia, Moscow, 1990.
- Losev, A. F., 'Tvorcheskii put' Vladimira Solov'eva', introduction to V. S. Solov'ev, Sochineniia v dvukh tomakh, 2nd ed., ed., comp. A. V. Gulyga and A. F. Losev, 2 vols, Moscow, 1990, I, pp. 3-32.
- Losev, A. F., 'V poiskakh smysla. (Iz besed i vospominanii)', in his Strast' k dialektike. Literaturnye razmyshleniia filosofa, ed. S. N. Zenkin, Moscow, 1990, pp. 14-67.
- Losev, A. F., Dialektika mifa, in his Filosofiia. Mifologiia. Kul'tura, comp. Iu. A. Rostovtsev, Moscow, 1991, pp. 21-186.
- Losev, A. F., 'Osnovnye osobennosti russkoi filosofii', in his Filosofiia. Mifologiia. Kul'tura, comp. Iu. A. Rostovtsev, Moscow, 1991, pp. 509-13.
- Losev, A. F., 'Russkaia filosofii', in his Filosofiia. Mifologiia. Kul'tura, comp. Iu. A. Rostovtsev, Moscow, 1991, pp. 209-36.
- Losskii, N. O., Istoriia russkoi filosofii, Moscow, 1991.
- Lutokhin, D., 'Vospominaniia o Rozanove', Vestnik literatury, 1921, 4-5, pp. 5-7.
- Maierova, O. E., 'Moskovskii Petimetr. (Iz istorii russkogo utopizma)', Litsa. Biograficheskii al'manakh, 4, ed., comp. N. I. Os'makova, Moscow - St Petersburg, 1994, pp. 54-71.
- Makhlina, V. L., 'Nasledie M. M. Bakhtin v kontekste zapadnogo postmodernizma', in M. M. Bakhtin kak filosof, ed. L. A. Gogotishvili and P. S. Gurevich, Moscow, 1992, pp. 206-20.
- Makhlina, V. L., 'Tretii Renessans', in Bakhtinologiia: Issledovaniia, perevody, publikatsii, ed. K. G. Isupov, Problemy bakhtinologii, 2, St Petersburg, 1995, pp. 132-54.

- Makovskii, Sergei, 'Religiozno-filosofskie sobraniia (1901-1902)', in his Na parnase "Serebrianogo veka", New York, 1986, pp. 13-33.
- Maksimov, D., Poeziia i proza Al. Bloka, Leningrad, 1981.
- Maksimov, D., 'O tom, kak ia videl i slyshal Andreia Belogo. Zarisovki iz dali', in his Russkie poety nachala veka, Leningrad, 1986, pp. 350-76.
- Mandel'shtam, Nadezhda, Vtoraia kniga, Moscow, 1990.
- Mandel'shtam, Osip, 'Deviatnadtsatyi vek', Sobranie sochinenii, ed. G. P. Struve and B. A. Filippov, 3 vols, 1967-1971, New York and Washington, II, New York, 1971, pp. 276-83.
- Mandel'shtam, Osip, 'O prirode slova', Sobranie sochinenii, II, New York, 1971, pp. 241-59.
- Mandel'shtam, Osip, 'O sobesednike', Sobranie sochinenii, II, New York, 1971, pp. 233-40.
- Mandel'shtam, Osip, 'Pis'mo k V. V. Gippiusu', Sobranie sochinenii, II, New York, 1971, pp. 483-85.
- Mandel'shtam, Osip, 'Pushkin i Skriabin. (Fragmenty)', Sobranie sochinenii, II, New York, 1971, pp. 313-19.
- Mandel'shtam, Osip, 'Slovo i kul'tura', Sobranie sochinenii, II, New York, 1971, pp. 222-27.
- Mandel'shtam, Osip, 'Utro Akmeizma', Sobranie sochinenii, II, New York, 1971, pp. 320-25.
- Mandel'shtam, Osip, 'Zametki o poezii', Sobranie sochinenii, II, New York, 1971, pp. 260-65.
- Matich, Olga, 'Dialectics of Cultural Return: Zinaida Gippius' Personal Myth', in Cultural Mythologies of Russian Modernism: From the Golden Age to the Silver Age, ed. Boris Gasparov, Robert P. Hughes and Irina Paperno, Berkeley, Los Angeles, 1992, pp. 52-72.
- Matich, Olga, 'Zinaida Gippius: Theory and Praxis of Love', in Readings in Russian Modernism to honor Vladimir Fedorovich Markov, ed. Ronald Vroon and John E. Malmstad, Moscow, 1993, pp. 237-50.
- Matich, Olga, 'The Symbolist meaning of love', in Creating Life: The Aesthetic Utopia of Russian Modernism, ed. Irina Paperno and Joan Delaney Grossman, Stanford, California, 1994, pp. 24-50.
- Matich, Olga, 'The Merezhkovskiis' Third Testament and the Russian Utopian Tradition', Christianity and the Eastern Slavs, ed. Boris Gasparov et al., Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1994, 3 vols, II, Russian Culture in Modern Times, ed. Robert P. Hughes and Irina Paperno, pp. 158-71.
- McReynolds, Louise, The News under Russia's Old Regime. The Development of a Mass-Circulation Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1991.
- Merezhkovskii, D. S., 'Revoliutsiia i religiia', Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, 17 vols, Moscow and St Petersburg, 1911-1913, X, 1911, pp. 33-92.
- Merezhkovskii, D. S., 'Griadushchii kham. O novom religioznom deistvii (otkrytoe pis'mo N. A. Berdiaevu)', Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, XI, 1911, pp. 149-71.

- Merezhkovskii, D. S., 'Misticheskie khuligany', Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, XII, 1911, pp. 315-23.
- Merezhkovskii, D. S., 'Reformatsiia ili revoliutsiia', Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, XII, 1911, pp. 287-97.
- Merezhkovskii, D. S., 'O prichinakh upadka i novykh techeniakh sovremennoi russkoi literatury', Polnoe sobranie sochinenii, XV, 1912, pp. 209-305.
- Merezhkovskii, D. S., 'Strannoe ditia', in his Bylo i budet, Moscow, 1915, pp. 237-53.
- Merezhkovskii, D. S., 'Novyi Vavilon', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 400-07.
- Merezhkovskii, D. S., 'Rozanov', V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 408-17.
- Michaut, J., Preface to V. V. Rozanov, Esseulement suivi de Mortellement, trans. Jacques Michaut (French translation of Uedinennoe and Smertnoe), Lausanne, 1980, pp. 7-21.
- Michaut, J., Introduction to V. V. Rozanov, Feuilles tombées, trans. Jacques Michaut (French translation of Opavshie list'ia), Lausanne, 1984, pp. vii-xv.
- Mikhailovskii, N. K., 'O g. Rozanove, ego velikikh otkrytiakh, ego makhanal'nosti i filosoficheskoi pornografii', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 337-60.
- Minskii, N., 'O dvukh putiakh dobra', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 388-99.
- Mirsky, D. S., A History of Russian Literature, London, 1949.
- Mirsky, D. S., 'Contemporary Movements in Russian Literature', in his Uncollected Writings on Russian Literature, ed., intro. G. S. Smith, Berkeley, 1989, pp. 258-82.
- Mirsky, D. S., 'Five Russian Letters', in his Uncollected Writings on Russian Literature, pp. 45-86.
- Mirsky, D. S., 'O moskovskoi literature i prototipe Avvakume', in his Uncollected Writings on Russian Literature, pp. 145-55.
- Mirsky, D. S., 'Veianie smerti v predrevoliutsionnoi literature', in his Uncollected Writings on Russian Literature, pp. 230-36.
- Mochul'skii, K. V., 'Zametki o Rozanove', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 388-93.
- Morson, Gary Saul, 'Prosaic Bakhtin: Landmarks, Anti-Intelligentsialism and the Russian Countertradition', in Bakhtin in Contexts. Across the Disciplines, ed. Amy Mandelker, Evanston, Illinois, 1995, pp. 33-78.
- Moser, Charles A., Esthetics as Nightmare: Russian Literary Theory 1855-70, Princeton, New Jersey, 1989.
- Myers, Diana, '"Hellenism" and "Barbarism" in Mandel'shtam', in Symbolism and After. Essays on Russian Poetry in honour of Georgette Donchin, ed.

- Arnold McMillin, Bristol, 1992, pp. 85-101.
- Nivat, Georges, 'Préface. L'arbre Rozanov', foreward to V. V. Rozanov, Feuilles tombées, trans. Jacques Michaut (French translation of Opavshie list'ia), Lausanne, 1984, pp. xvii-xxvi.
- Nivat, Georges, 'Dans l'haleine de la mort: Rozanov et Andreiev', in his Vers la fin du mythe russe. Essais sur la culture russe de Gogol a nos jours, Lausanne, 1988, pp. 143-49.
- Nosov, S. N., V. V. Rozanov. Estetika svobody, St. Petersburg and Dusseldorf, 1993.
- Ostroi, O. S., 'Pervyi bibliograf V. V. Rozanova', Sovetskaia bibliografiia, 1989, 5, pp. 82-85.
- Pachmuss, Temira, Zinaida Hippus. An Intellectual Profile, Carbondale and Edwardsville, Illinois, 1971.
- Pachmuss, Temira, Intellect and Ideas in Action. Selected Correspondence of Zinaida Hippus, Munich, 1972.
- Pachmuss, Temira, Between Paris and St. Petersburg. Selected Diaries of Zinaida Hippus, Urbana, Illinois, 1975.
- Palievskii, P. V., 'Rozanov i Florenskii', Literaturnaia ucheba, 1989, 1, pp. 111-15.
- Palievskii, P. V., 'Vasilii Vasil'evich Rozanov', Literaturnaia gazeta, 28 June 1989, 26, p. 5.
- Paperno, Irina, 'On the Nature of the Word. Theological Sources of Mandel'shtam's Dialogue with the Symbolists', Christianity and the Eastern Slavs, ed. Boris Gasparov et al., 3 vols, II, Russian Culture in Modern Times, ed. Robert P. Hughes and Irina Paperno, Berkeley, 1994, pp. 287-310.
- Pasternak, Boris, 'Neskol'ko polozhenii', in his Ob iskusstve, comp. E. B. and E. V. Pasternak, Moscow, 1990, pp. 143-47.
- Pasternak, Boris, 'Liudi i polozheniia', in his Ob iskusstve, comp. E. B. and E. V. Pasternak, Moscow, 1990, pp. 192-238.
- Patterson, David, Literature and Spirit. Essays on Bakhtin and his Contemporaries, Lexington, Kentucky, 1988.
- Pertsov, P. P., '"Novyi Put"', introduction to the first issue, Novyi put', 1903, 1, pp. 1-9.
- Pertsov, P. P., 'Mezhdu starym i novym', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 174-79.
- Pertsov, P. P., '"Opavshie list'ia" korob II', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 182-83.
- Pertsov, P. P., 'Rets.: V. Rozanov, "Opavshie list'ia"', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 180-81.
- Pervov, P. D., 'Filosof v provintsii (iz literaturno-pedagogicheskikh vospominanii', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 88-101.
- Piatigorskii, A., '"Plemiannik svoego diadi". (Filosofskie zametki o knige A. Siniavskogo "Opavshie List'ia" V. V. Rozanova"')', Izbrannye trudy, comp. G. Amelin,

- Moscow, 1996, pp. 242-50.
- Pirog, Gerald, 'The Language of Love and the Limits of Language', in Aleksandr Blok Centennial Conference, ed. Walter N. Vickery and Bogdan B. Sagatov, Columbus, Ohio, 1984, pp. 225-36.
- Pishun, V. K. and Pishun, S.V., "Religiia zhizni" V. Rozanova, Vladivostok, 1994.
- Poggioli, Renato, 'On the Works and Thoughts of Vasilii Rozanov', in his The Phoenix and the Spider, Cambridge, Mass., 1957, pp. 158-207.
- Poggioli, Renato, Rozanov, 2nd ed., London, 1962.
- Poltoratskii, N., 'Russkaia religioznaia filosiia', in his Rossia i revoliutsiia, Tenafly, New Jersey, 1988, pp. 11-32.
- Pomeranskaia, Tat'iana, 'Vsego lish' nepolnyi god...', Literaturnaia ucheba, 1989, 6, pp. 125-26.
- Ponzio, Augusto, '"Drugost'" u Bakhtina, Blansho i Levinasa', in Bakhtinologia. Issledovaniia, perevody, publikatsii, ed. K. G. Isupov, Problemy bakhtinologii, 2, St Petersburg, 1995, pp. 61-78.
- Poselianin, E., 'Religioznaia evoliutsiia g. Rozanova (po povodu knigi "Uedinennoe")', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 169-73.
- Prishvin, M. M., 'Prishvin o Rozanove', pub. L. A. Riazanova, Kontekst, 1990, pp. 161-218.
- Pyman, Avril, The Life of Aleksandr Blok, 2 vols, I, The Distant Thunder, 1880-1908, Oxford, 1979, II, The Release of Harmony, 1908-21, Oxford, 1980.
- Pyman, Avril, 'The Church and the Intelligentsia with Special Reference to the Religious-Philosophical Meetings in St Petersburg, 1901-1903', in Russian Thought and Society 1890-1917. Essays in Honour of Eugene Lampert, ed. Roger Bartlett, Keele, 1984, pp. 181-219.
- Pyman, Avril, 'Aleksandr Blok and the Merezhkovskiis (New materials and general survey)', in Aleksandr Blok Centennial Conference, ed. Walter N. Vickery and Bogdan B. Sagatov, Columbus, Ohio, 1984, pp. 237-70.
- Pyman, Avril, A History of Russian Symbolism, Cambridge, 1994.
- Pyman, Avril, 'Symbolism and Philosophical Discourse', Russian Literature, 36, 1994, pp. 371-86.
- Read, Christopher, Religion, Revolution and the Russian Intelligentsia 1900-1912. The Vekhi Debate and its Background, London, 1979.
- Remizov, A., Kukha. Rozanovy pis'ma, Berlin, 1923.
- Remizov, A., Podstrizhennymi glazami, Paris, 1951.
- Remizov, A., Vzvikhrennaia Rus', Moscow, 1991.
- Remizov, A., Vstrechi. Peterburgskii buerak, Paris, 1981.
- Remizov, A., Rossia v pis'menakh, I, New York, 1982.
- Remizov, A., 'O ponimani', pub. A. M. Gracheva, in Aleksei Remizov. Issledovaniia i materialy, ed. A. M. Gracheva, St Petersburg, 1994, pp. 225-30.
- Remizov, A., '"Voistinu". Pamiati V. V. Rozanova', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologia, comp. V. A.

- Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 352-56.
- Rilke, R-M., 'Pis'mo k A. N. Benua', pub. K. M. Azadovskii and L. N. Chertkov, in his Vorpsvede. Ogiust Roden. Pis'ma. Stikhi, ed. Iu. Kashkarov, Moscow, 1971, pp. 174-82.
- Rilke, R-M., 'Pis'ma v Rossiiu', pub. K. M. Azadovskii, Voprosy literatury, 1975, 9, pp. 215-42.
- Rilke, R-M., and Benua, A. N., 'Perepiska 1900-1902 gg.', pub. K. M. Azadovskii, Pamiatniki kul'tury. Novye otkrytiia, 1976, Moscow, 1977, pp. 75-105.
- Romanoff, Janet S., Vasily Rozanov: The Iurodivyi of Russian Literature, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1975.
- Romanov, I. F., Listopad, Kiev, 1892.
- Romanov, I. F., 'Iz perepiski s N. G. Giliarovym-Platonovym', Letopisets, 1904, 1, pp. 63-64, 3-4, pp. 137-43, 9, pp. 297-302, 10, pp. 345-49, and 12, pp. 407-13.
- Romanov, I. F., 'Iz pis'ma Iv. F. Romanova k N. P. Giliarovu-Platonovu', Letopisets, 1904, 12, pp. 413-19.
- Romanov, I. F., 'Zametki na poliakhs', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, ed. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 16-24.
- Rosenthal, Bernice Glatzer, 'A New Word for a New Myth: Nietzsche and Russian Futurism', in The European Foundations of Russian Modernism, ed. Peter I. Barta, Lewiston, New York, 1991, pp. 219-50.
- Rosenthal, Bernice Glatzer, 'The "New Religious Consciousness": Pavel Florenskii's Path to a Revitalized Orthodoxy', Christianity and the Eastern Slavs, ed. Boris Gasparov et al., 3 vols, II, Russian Culture in Modern Times, ed. Robert P. Hughes and Irina Paperno, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1994, pp. 134-57.
- Rostovtsev, Iu. A., 'P. A. Florenskii po vospominaniam Alekseia Loseva', Kontekst, 1990, pp. 6-24.
- Rozanova, N. V., 'Primechanie k knige N. V. Rozanovoi "iz moikh vospominanii"', pub. Iu. K. Teriapiano, Novyi zhurnal, 92, 1968, pp. 130-32.
- Rozanova, T. V., 'Vospominaniia ob otse, Vasilii Vasil'eviche Rozanove, i vsei sem'e', pub. L. A. Il'iunina and M. M. Pavlova, Russkaia literatura, 1989, 3, pp. 209-32, 4, pp. 160-78.
- Ruud, Charles A., Fighting Words: Imperial Censorship and the Russian Press, 1804-1906, Toronto, 1982.
- Ruud, Charles A., Russian Entrepreneur. Publisher Ivan Sytin of Moscow, 1851-1934, Montreal and Kingston, 1990.
- Saraskina, Liudmila, Vozliublennaia Dostoevskogo. Apollinariia Suslova: biografiia v dokumentakh, pis'makh, materialakh, Moscow, 1994.
- Sharapov, S. F., 'Vasilii Vasil'evich Rozanov', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 322-24.
- Sharapov, S. F., Neopoznannyi genii, Moscow, 1903.



- Segal, D., 'Literatura kak okhrannaia gramota', Slavica Hierosolymitana, 5-6, 1981, pp. 151-244.
- Selivanov, Aleksei, 'Psikhologiiia iudofil'stva V. V. Rozanova', Russkaia mysl', 1917, 2, pp. 49-64.
- Shepherd, David, 'Bakhtin and the Reader', in Bakhtin and Cultural Theory, ed. Ken Hirschkop and David Shepherd, Manchester, 1989, pp. 91-108.
- Shestov, Lev, 'Pokhvala gluposti', in his Nachala i kontsy. Sbornik statei, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1978 (reprint of St Petersburg, 1908 edition), pp. 92-123.
- Shestov, Lev, 'V. V. Rozanov', pub. V. A. Tunimanov, Russkaia literatura, 1991, 3, pp. 47-51(51).
- Shestov, Lev, Apofeoz bespochvennosti. Opyt dogmاتического myshleniia, Leningrad, 1991.
- Shestova-Barabanova, N., Zhizn' L'va Shestova, 2 vols, Paris, 1983.
- Shklovskii, V. B., Siuzhet kak iavlenie stilia, Petrograd, 1922.
- Shklovskii, V. B., O teorii prozy, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1985 (reprint of Moscow, 1929 edition).
- Shklovskii, Viktor, 'Voskreshenie slova', in Texte der Russischen Formalisten, 2 vols, Munich, 1969 and 1972, II, ed. Inge Paulmann, 1972, pp. 2-16.
- Shklovskii, V. B., Zoo, ili pis'ma ne o liubvi, Sobranie sochinenii, ed. L. Polosina, 3 vols, Moscow, 1973-1974, I, 1973, pp. 163-230.
- Shklovskii, V. B., 'Rozanov', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 321-42.
- Shperk, F. E., 'V. V. Rozanov (opyt kharakteristiki)', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 261-62.
- Shukman, Ann, 'Reading Bakhtin with a Stiff Upper Lip', Scottish Slavonic Review, 6, 1986, pp. 122-26.
- Siniavskii, Andrei, "Opavshie List'ia" V. V. Rozanova, Paris, 1982.
- Slobin, Greta N., Remizov's Fictions 1900-1912, Dekalb, Illinois, 1991.
- Slobin, Greta N., 'Dinamika slukha i zreniia v poetike Alekseia Remizova', in Aleksei Remizov. Issledovaniia i materialy, ed. A. M. Gracheva, St Petersburg, 1994, pp. 157-65.
- Solov'ev, V. S., 'Konets spora', Sobranie sochinenii, ed. S. M. Solov'ev and E. L. Radlov, 2nd ed., 10 vols, St Petersburg, 1914, VI, pp. 456-84.
- Solov'ev, V. S., 'Ideia sverkhcheloveka', Sochineniia, ed., comp. A. F. Losev and A. V. Gulyga, 2nd ed., 2 vols, Moscow, 1990, II, pp. 626-34.
- Solov'ev, V. S., 'Osoboe chestvovanie Pushkina', in his Filosofiia iskusstva i literaturnaia kritika, comp. R. Gal'tseva and I. Rodnianskaia, Moscow, 1991, pp. 300-10.
- Solov'ev, V. S., 'Protiv ispolnitel'nogo lista', in his Filosofiia iskusstva i literaturnaia kritika, comp. R. Gal'tseva and I. Rodnianskaia, Moscow, 1991, pp. 310-16.

- Solov'ev, V. S., 'Pamiati K. N. Leont'eva', in K. N. Leont'ev: pro et contra. Antologiya, 2 vols, comp. A. P. Kozyrev and A. A. Korol'kov, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 20-26.
- Solov'ev, V. S., 'Porfirii Golovlev o svobode i vere', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 282-92.
- Spasovskii, M. M., V. V. Rozanov v poslednie gody svoei zhizni, 2nd ed., New York, 1968.
- Stammmler, Heinrich A., 'Apocalyptic Speculations in the Works of D. H. Lawrence and Vasilii Vasil'evich Rozanov', Die Welt der Slaven, 4, 1959, 1, pp. 66-73.
- Stammmler, Heinrich A., 'Conservatism and Dissent: V. V. Rozanov's Political Philosophy', Russian Review, 32, 1973, 3, pp. 241-53.
- Stammmler, Heinrich A., 'Apocalypse: V. V. Rozanov and D. H. Lawrence', Canadian Slavonic Papers, 16, 1974, 2, pp. 221-24.
- Stammmler, Heinrich A., 'Vasily Rozanov as a Philosopher', Modern Age: A Quarterly Review, 28, 1984, 2-3, pp. 143-51.
- Strakhov, N. N., 'Vospominaniia ob Apollone Grigor'eva' in Apollon Grigor'ev, Vospominaniia, ed. R. V. Ivanov-Razumnik, Moscow-Leningrad, 1930, pp. 431-517.
- Strakhov, N. N., 'Eshche o peterburgskoi literature. Pis'mo k redaktoru "Vremeni" po povodu dvukh sovremennykh statei', (Vremia, June 1861), in his Iz istorii literaturnogo nigilizma (1861-1865), The Hague, 1967 (reprint of St Petersburg, 1890 edition), pp. 14-38.
- Strakhov, N. N., 'Nechto o molchanii', in his Iz istorii literaturnogo nigilizma (1861-1865), The Hague, 1967 (reprint of St Petersburg, 1890 edition), pp. 568-71.
- Strakhov, N. N., 'Tiazheloe vremia. Pis'mo v redaktsiiu "Vremeni"', (Vremia, Oct., 1862), in his 149-82.
- Strakhov, N. N., 'Vozdushnye iavleniia', in his Bor'ba s Zapadom v nashei literature, 3 vols, The Hague, 1969 (reprint of Kiev, 1897-1898 edition), II, pp. 145-71.
- Strakhov, N. N., '"Legenda o Velikom inkvizitore" F. M. Dostoevskogo. Opyt kriticheskogo kommentariia, V. Rozanova Spb. 1894.' (review), in his Bor'ba s Zapadom v nashei literature, 3 vols, The Hague, 1969 (reprint of Kiev, 1897-1898 edition), III, pp. 220-27.
- Struve, P. B., 'Bol'shoi pisatel' s organicheskim porokom. Neskol'ko slov o V. V. Rozanove', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiya, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 378-87.
- Struve, Nikita, Ossip Mandelstam, Paris, 1982.
- Sukach, V. G., introduction to his publication of V. V. Rozanov, 'Russkii Nil', Novyi Mir, 1989, 7, pp. 189-92.
- Sukach, V. G., 'Zagadki lichnosti Rozanova', introduction to V. V. Rozanov, O sebe i zhizni svoei, comp. V. G. Sukach, Moscow, 1990, pp. 7-30.
- Sukach, V. G., 'Kommentarii', in V. V. Rozanov, O sebe i zhizni svoei, comp. V. G. Sukach, Moscow, 1990, pp. 713-808.

- Sukach, V. G., 'O V. V. Rozanove. Interv'iu s V. G. Sukachom', interviewed by Natal'ia Skorobogat'ko, Nachala, 1991, 1, pp. 33-43.
- Sukach, V. G., 'Zhizn' Vasiliia Vasil'evicha Rozanova "kak ona est'", Moskva, 1991, 10, pp. 135-36, 11, pp. 141-53, 1992, 1, pp. 108-31, 2-4, pp. 120-29.
- Sukach, V. G., 'Rozanov', entry in Russkaia filosofiiia. Malyi entsiklopedicheskii slovar', ed. A. I. Aleshin et al, Moscow, 1995, pp. 448-52.
- Suvorin, A. S., Dnevnik A. S. Suvorina, ed. M. Krichevskii, Moscow - Petrograd, 1923.
- Tamarchenko, N. D., 'M. Bakhtin i V. Rozanov. (Ideia "rodovogo tela" i krizis khristianskoi etiki na rubezhe XIX-XX vv.)', in Bakhtinologiiia: Issledovaniia, perevody, publikatsii, ed. K. G. Isupov, Problemy bakhtinologii, 2, St Petersburg, 1995, pp. 171-88.
- Tavis, Anna A., Rilke's Russia. A Cultural Encounter, Evanston, Illinois, 1994.
- Terras, Victor, Belinskii and Russian Literary Criticism: The Heritage of Organic Aesthetics, Madison, Wisconsin, 1974.
- Terts, Abram (Siniavskii, A.), Mysli vrasplokh, New York, 1966.
- Terts, Abram (Siniavskii, A.), Golos iz khora, London, 1973.
- Titunik, I. R., 'The Baxtin Problem: Concerning Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist's Mikhail Bakhtin', Slavic and East European Journal, 30, 1986, 1, pp. 91-95.
- Tjalsma, H. W., 'The Petersburg Poets', Russian Modernism. Culture and the Avant-Garde, 1900-1930, ed. George Gibian and H. W. Tjalsma, Ithaca, New York, 1976, pp. 65-84.
- Todorov, Tzvetan, Mikhail Bakhtin: The Dialogical Principle, trans. Wlad Godzich, Theory and History of Literature, 13, Manchester, 1984.
- Todorov, Tzvetan, 'Human and Interhuman: Mikhail Bakhtin', chapter in his Literature and Its Theorists. A Personal View of Twentieth-century Criticism, trans. Catherine Porter, London, 1988, pp. 70-88.
- Tolstoi, L. N., Perepiska L. N. Tolstogo s N. N. Strakhovym, St Petersburg, 1913.
- Trotskii, L. D., 'Mistitsizm i kanonizatsiia Rozanova', in his Literatura i revoliutsiia, Moscow, 1991, pp. 46-49.
- Trubetskoi, S. N., 'Chuvstvitel'nyi i khladnokrovnyi', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 293-302.
- Tsvetaeva, A. I., 'V. V. Rozanov. (Iz "Vospominanii")', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 222-27.
- Tsvetaeva, Marina, 'Pis'ma k V. V. Rozanovu', Sobranie sochinenii, ed. Anna Saakiantz and Lev Minukhin, 7 vols, Moscow, 1994-95, VI, Pis'ma, 1995, pp. 119-30.

- Tsybin, Vladimir, 'Stranstviia i bluzhdaniia mysli Vasiliia Rozanova', Literaturnaia Rossiia, 30 September, 1988, pp. 18-19.
- Turbin, Vladimir, 'Rozanov', Smena, 1990, 11, pp. 128-45.
- Tynianov, Iurii N., 'Dostoevskii i Gogol'. (K teorii parodii)', in Texte der Russischen Formalisten, 2 vols, Munich, 1969 and 1972, I, ed. Witold Kosny, 1969, pp. 300-71.
- Tynianov, Iurii N., 'Illiustratsii' in Texte der Russischen Formalisten, 2 vols, Munich, 1969 and 1972, I, ed. Witold Kosny, 1969, pp. 500-11.
- Vanchugov, Vasilii, Ocherk istorii filosofii "samobytno-russkoi", Moscow, 1994.
- Venclova, Tomas, 'Viacheslav Ivanov and the Crisis of Russian Symbolism', in Issues in Russian Literature before 1917, ed. J. Douglas Clayton, Columbus, Ohio, 1989, pp. 209-15.
- Volzhskii, 'Misticheskii panteizm Rozanova', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, I, pp. 418-55.
- Vroon, Ronald, 'The Old Belief and Sectarianism as Cultural Models in the Silver Age', Christianity and the Eastern Slavs, ed. Boris Gasparov et al, 3 vols, II, Russian Culture in Modern Times, ed. Robert P. Hughes and Irina Paperno, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1994, pp. 172-90.
- Weidlé, Wladimir, 'The Poison of Modernism', in Russian Modernism. Culture and the Avant-Garde, 1900-1930, ed. George Gibian and H. W. Tjalsma, Ithaca, New York, 1976, pp. 18-30.
- Zakrzhevskii, A. K., Karamazovshchina. Psikhologicheskie paralleli, Kiev, 1912.
- Zakrzhevskii, A. K., 'Religiia. Psikhologicheskie paralleli. V. V. Rozanov', in V. V. Rozanov: pro et contra. Antologiiia, comp. V. A. Fateev, 2 vols, St Petersburg, 1995, II, pp. 147-68.
- Zen'kovskii, V. V., 'Rozanov i Shestov', Istoriia russkoi filosofii, 2 vols, Paris, 1989 (reprint of 1948-50 edition), I, pp. 457-68.
- Zen'kovskii, V. V., Istoriia russkoi filosofii, 2 vols, Paris, 1989 (reprint of Paris, 1948-50 edition).
- Zernov, Nicholas, The Russian Religious Renaissance of the Twentieth Century, London, 1963.
- Zhiglevich, Evgeniia, introduction to V. V. Rozanov, Izbrannoe, ed. Evgeniia Zhiglevich, Munich, 1970, pp. xxxviii - xli.
- Zlobin, V., Tiazhelaia dusha, Washington, 1970.

